

Request for Proposal (RFP) for Library Delivery and Sorting Services for Massachusetts Libraries

RFP issued July 15, 2010 by the
Massachusetts Library System, Inc. (MLS)
135 Beaver Street, Waltham, MA 02452
781-398-1819

MLS Document: RFP/2010-07-15

Responses Due: 4:00 pm EDT, August 31, 2010

1 Planned Schedule of Events (subject to change, which, if necessary, will be announced on www.masslibsystem.org)

Date	Event
July 29, 2010 at 10:00am-1:00pm at MinuteMan Library Network, 10 Strathmore Road, Natick, MA 01760 Phone: (508) 655-8008 Directions: www.mln.lib.ma.us/dir.htm	Public Meeting with potential respondents to discuss questions about this RFP. A remote option will be posted for those unable to attend in person
August 2, 2010, 4:00 pm EDT	Questions about this RFP will be accepted in writing until this time at: rfp@masslibsystem.org
August 16, 2010	A summary of discussions at the abovementioned meeting and responses to written questions will be posted at www.masslibsystem.org
August 31, 2010, 4:00 pm EDT	RFP Responses Due to: rfp@masslibsystem.org
September 15, 2010	Review of RFP responses begins
October and November 2010	Selected respondent presentations
January 2011	Site inspection(s)
January 2011	Decision on Contractor
February 2011	Contract negotiations
July 1, 2011	Implementation of new statewide sorting and delivery service.

The Massachusetts Library System, Inc. (MLS) requests proposals to provide sorting of library materials (about 13-14 million per year) six evenings and/or nights per week and pick up and delivery of these materials at member libraries Monday through Saturday (approximately 540 libraries and 70 library branches/bookmobiles). MLS seeks solutions related to all aspects of the daily delivery service including labeling, packaging, pick up, sorting, and transport.

We offer two models for responses to ensure that MLS may provide the most cost-effective solution for all services beginning July 1, 2011.

We encourage respondents to consider responding to one of two models or to provide two separate responses, one for each model.

Model 1 - Delivery and Network-Based Sorting (Using connection to networks to determine destination for networked libraries.) Responses to this model will eliminate the need for networked libraries to place a delivery label indicating the destination on/in each outgoing item.

Model 2 - Delivery and Label-Based Sorting (Stand-alone with no connection to networks. A label placed by shipping library is used to determine destination) Responses to this model require all libraries (networked and non-networked) to place a delivery label indicating the destination on/in each outgoing item.

Responses are sought that will ensure MLS will provide a cost-effective solution for all delivery and sorting services beginning July 1, 2011.

Table of Contents

1	Planned Schedule of Events	1
1.1	MLS Authority.....	5
2	Introduction	6
2.1	Responses Sought.....	6
2.2	RFP Responses.....	6
2.3	RFP Purpose.....	7
3	Critical Success Factors	7
3.1	Improvements in efficiency, safety, and ergonomics for library staff.....	7
3.2	Improvements in customer service for library patrons.....	7
3.3	Cost savings for MLS and libraries.....	7
3.4	Avoid need for MLS to make significant capital investment.....	7
3.5	Vendor performance guarantees with effective monitoring systems, incentives for exceptional performance, and penalties for under-performance.....	7
4	Goals	8
4.1	Model 1: Delivery and Network-Based Sorting.....	8
4.2	Model 2: Delivery and Label-Based Sorting.....	8
5	Definitions	10
6	Current Delivery and Sorting Services Description	10
7	Special Issues	12
7.1	Out of Network Items.....	12
7.2	Transportation Issues.....	12
7.3	Unique Delivery Challenges in Massachusetts.....	13
7.4	Labeling.....	15
7.5	Packaging.....	16
7.6	Library Receiving Process.....	17
7.7	Library Access, Delivery Time and Delivery Frequency.....	17
7.8	Sorting Issues.....	18
7.9	Pricing Issues.....	18
7.10	Future Volume.....	18
7.11	Future Changes in Materials Movement.....	19
7.12	General Information.....	20
8	Submission Procedures	21
8.1	Instructions for Responding to this RFP.....	21
8.2	22
8.2	Deadlines: see page 1.....	22
8.3	Questions Regarding this RFP.....	22
8.4	Other Communications.....	22
8.5	Proposal Pricing and Billing Conditions (see Response Form: Section 12: About Pricing).....	22
9	Responsibility	24
9.1	Contractor Responsibility.....	24
9.2	MLS Responsibility.....	25
9.3	Motor Vehicle Liability and Other Insurance.....	25
10	Evaluation Criteria Checklist	26

Related Documents:

Model 1: Respondent Form for Delivery and Network-Based Sorting

Model 2: Respondent Form for Delivery and Label-Based Sorting

Appendix A: March 2010 Regional Delivery Volume Sample and Routing Schedule Data:
Describes the volume of pick up and delivery at each stop during a sample week in March/April 2010. This time period is a typical volume periods of the year. The names and addresses of all current stops are listed here as is information on tote inventories.

According to recent samples, items in delivery are estimated to be comprised of the following material types:

- 65% Books
- 10% CD's
- 18% DVD's
- 7% Misc. and other

Appendix B: Network Volume Data

Network data on month-to-month transactions for fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010.

Appendix C: Network Survey Data

Network data on branches, bookmobiles, system specifications, SIP2 capabilities, and policies.

Appendix D: Non-Network Traffic Report for fiscal year 2010. Reflects intersystem requests placed on the Massachusetts Statewide Virtual Catalog (SIRSI/DYNIX URSA system). Annual volume 90,000 requests which equals 180,000 shipments of library materials.

Appendix E: Consultant's Report at: <http://www.nmrls.org/msdc/consultants-report.pdf>

Appendix F: Resources at Whately, Massachusetts MLS Office

Appendix G: Cross-State Delivery Sample Data

Appendix H: Branch Libraries and Bookmobiles

1.1 Authority: Massachusetts Library System, Inc.

The Massachusetts Library System, Inc. (MLS) is incorporated as a 501(c)3 not-for-profit corporation. MLS is a multitype library cooperative funded through the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners. Chapter 78: Section 19C of the General Laws of Massachusetts authorizes the Board of Library Commissioners to “establish a comprehensive, statewide program of regional library service, consisting of regional library systems . . . for the purpose of providing reference and research services, interlibrary loan, delivery, and other regional services to public, school, academic, and special libraries in the region . . .”

MLS comprises the joint membership of the six former Massachusetts Regional Library Systems that participated in a related Request for Information issued in 2009 by the Northeast Massachusetts Regional Library System (NMRLS). The six former regions will consolidate all services on July 1, 2010 at the MLS.

Massachusetts Library System, Inc.
135 Beaver Street
Waltham, MA 02452
781-398-1819

While MLS is the sole organization issuing this RFP, much of the data provided here was gathered prior to the merger and is identified as being from one or more predecessor regions:

Boston Massachusetts Regional Library System (BRLS)
Central Massachusetts Regional Library System (CMRLS)
Metrowest Massachusetts Regional Library System (Metrowest)
Northeast Massachusetts Regional Library System (NMRLS)
Southeastern Massachusetts Regional Library System (SEMLS)
Western Massachusetts Regional Library System (WMRLS)

1.2 Other Stakeholders

Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners
(State Agency that funds the MLS)
98 North Washington Street, Suite 401
Boston, MA 02114
617-725-1860
Contact: Paul Kissman

Autosort RFP Task Force - (see roster at autosort.pbworks.com)

Shared ILS (Integrated Library System) Networks. Listed by former region.

Systems used by BRLS Libraries
Network Name: Metro-Boston Library Network (MBLN)
Network Name: FLO (Fenway Libraries Online)

System used by CMRLS and WMRLS Libraries
Network Name: CW/MARS

System used by Metrowest Libraries
Network Name: Minuteman Library Network

Systems used by NMRLS Libraries
Network Name: MVLC (Merrimack Valley Library Consortium)
Network Name: NOBLE (North of Boston Library Exchange)

Systems Used by SEMLS Libraries
Network Name: CLAMS
Network Name: OCLN
Network Name: SAILS

A statewide system for schools and special libraries that is not fully involved in delivery at this point is MassCat. This system might grow to include more delivery participants.
Network Name: MassCat

See also: Members, links, etc.: <http://mblc.state.ma.us/libraries/networks/index.php>

Appendix A includes volume information for each network member; Appendix B includes volume trend data for the networks; and Appendix C includes details about the systems used by networks.

2 Introduction

2.1 Responses Sought

The Massachusetts Library System, Inc. (MLS) requests proposals to provide overnight sorting of library materials (about 13-14 million per year) and pick up and delivery of these materials at member libraries (approximately 540 libraries and 70 library branches/bookmobiles). MLS seeks solutions related to all aspects of the daily delivery service including labeling, packaging, pick up, sorting, and transport.

2.2 RFP Responses

We offer two models for responses to ensure that MLS may provide the most cost-effective solution for all services beginning July 1, 2011.

We encourage respondents to consider responding to one of two models or to provide two separate responses, one for each model.

Model 1 - Delivery and Network-Based Sorting (Using connection to networks to determine destination for networked libraries.) Responses to this model will eliminate the need for networked libraries to place a delivery label indicating the destination on/in each

outgoing item.

Model 2 - Delivery and Label-Based Sorting (Stand-alone with no connection to networks. A label placed by shipping library is used to determine destination) Responses to this model require all libraries (networked and non-networked) to place a delivery label indicating the destination on/in each outgoing item.

Responses are sought that will ensure MLS will provide a cost-effective solution for all services described above beginning July 1, 2011.

2.3 RFP Purpose

The Request for Proposal contains detailed information about the library delivery services operating throughout the state of Massachusetts. In order to understand the challenges faced by libraries, it is important to understand the details: including how the network software is used to make and track requests, how individual library items are identified, how the material moves between libraries, the work associated with labeling and sorting, costs of each component, accuracy and turnaround time requirements, volume of material, delivery locations, and expectations about how the demands of the service are likely to change in the future.

We seek detailed proposals that apply library and logistics industry standard practices to enhance library delivery service and the tasks related to it as described in the critical success factors described below as well as meet the mandatory requirements specified below. Proposals that provide additional services that meet the desirable goals or other useful enhancements identified by respondents are sought.

The purpose of this RFP is to gather proposals from vendors to allow MLS to contract for efficient, dependable, and cost-effective library delivery services throughout Massachusetts beginning on July 1, 2011.

3 Critical Success Factors

- 3.1 Improvements in efficiency, safety, and ergonomics for library staff.***
- 3.2 Improvements in customer service for library patrons.***
- 3.3 Cost savings for MLS and libraries.***
- 3.4 Avoid need for MLS to make significant capital investment.***
- 3.5 Vendor performance guarantees with effective monitoring systems, incentives for exceptional performance, and penalties for under-performance.***

4 Goals

4.1 Model 1: Delivery and Network-Based Sorting

4.1.1 Mandatory goals

- 4.1.1.1 Eliminate the need for networked libraries to label materials shipped among members of a given network.
- 4.1.1.2 Design and provide an efficient workaround for non-networked libraries and out of network items
- 4.1.1.3 Provide deliveries to each library location with separate containers for all items that are for a library, library branch, or bookmobile
- 4.1.1.4 Provide deliveries to the highest volume libraries with separate containers for items "on hold" and items for "return to shelf".
- 4.1.1.5 Provide next delivery day turn-around for all libraries receiving daily service
- 4.1.1.6 Provide on time delivery/pick-up 99 percent of the time
- 4.1.1.7 Provide 99.75 percent sorting accuracy.
- 4.1.1.8 Provide 99.75 percent correct tote delivery accuracy
- 4.1.1.9 Eliminate 99 percent of packaging
- 4.1.1.10 Eliminate presorting and bundling of outgoing items from libraries

4.1.2 Desirable goals

- 4.1.2.1 Provide recommended solution to adding an external bar code label to each item that lacks it as it enters the sorting process
- 4.1.2.2 Provide deliveries to larger libraries with separate containers for customized categories, e.g., specific collections, locations, media type. "
- 4.1.2.3 Provide for batch check in (tote level or delivery manifest level)
- 4.1.2.4 Provide access to online item status reporting for items in the delivery workflow
- 4.1.2.5 Provide 99.9 percent sorting accuracy
- 4.1.2.6 Provide 99.9 percent correct tote delivery accuracy
- 4.1.2.7 Improve efficiency, ergonomics, and safety in libraries
- 4.1.2.8 Improve service to library patrons

4.2 Model 2: Delivery and Label-Based Sorting

4.2.1 Mandatory goals

- 4.2.1.1 Provide next delivery day turn-around for all libraries receiving daily service
- 4.2.1.2 Provide on time delivery/pick-up 99 percent of the time
- 4.2.1.3 Provide 99.5 percent sorting accuracy.
- 4.2.1.4 Provide 99.5 percent correct tote delivery accuracy
- 4.2.1.5 Eliminate 99 percent of packaging
- 4.2.1.6 Eliminate presorting and bundling of outgoing items from libraries
- 4.2.1.7 Design and recommend an efficient labeling system for all libraries to replace existing disparate designs.

4.2.2 Desirable goals

- 4.2.2.1 Provide deliveries to each library location with separate containers for all items that are for a library, library branch, or bookmobile
- 4.2.2.2 Provide 99.9 percent sorting accuracy
- 4.2.2.3 Provide 99.9 percent correct tote delivery accuracy
- 4.2.2.4 Improve efficiency, ergonomics, and safety in libraries
- 4.2.2.5 Improve service to library patrons

5 Definitions

Hold vs. Return: When items are processed for shipping they usually have one of these statuses. An item on "hold" is being shipped to a library at which a patron is awaiting its arrival. It is usually beneficial to process the "hold" items first. An item with the status "return" to shelf is being shipped to a library for reshelving. No one is waiting specifically for its delivery.

Hold Slip: A slip of paper placed on or inside a library item indicating that it is being held for a specific patron. The Hold Slip usually displays the bar code of the item it is placed in and the last name of the patron for whom it is held. Items are usually shelved alphabetically by patron name (for self-service holds pick-up) so the name should be printed using a large font.

Network: A shared integrated library system (ILS) which tracks circulation and destination information for groups of libraries. There are nine networks in Massachusetts to include in responses for Model 1.

Networked library: A library that is a member of a network. Patrons can request items from all network participants. As these requests are filled by other libraries, the items will enter the delivery service.

Next Delivery Day Turnaround: The standard for delivery turnaround time. Each item picked up at a shipping library is delivered the next day delivery is scheduled for the receiving library.

Non-networked library: A library that is not a participant in any of the nine networks. It is not possible to ascertain the shipping destination automatically for items being exchanged with these libraries.

Out of network item: An item that is being loaned or returned to/from a library in a different network. It is very difficult to ascertain the shipping destination automatically for these items.

Tote: Shipping container. Current services use several different types of container.

6 Current Delivery and Sorting Services Description

Delivery and sorting service is provided to support the Massachusetts interlibrary loan programs. Through this program, member libraries loan and return library materials. Approximately 540 libraries and 70 library branches/bookmobiles take advantage of library delivery services. It is likely that the number of libraries participating in interlibrary delivery will continue to slowly grow. The total number of libraries is about 1,880.

Most of the participating libraries receive daily delivery. For current routing and volume details, see Appendix A: March 2010 Regional Delivery Volume Sample and Routing Schedule Data.

This service currently includes pick up of library material in totes which are currently taken to one of five sorting locations. The vast majority of totes require sorting. A small percentage of totes are pre-sorted, which means all items in the tote can be delivered to a single destination without sorting. We no longer request libraries to pre-sort and discourage proposals that include presorting in RFP responses. Some regional personnel and resources also support the delivery program. The level of support varies based on the level of services contracted to third-party vendors. We are seeking proposals that reduce the need for regional staff efforts for this service.

Because of the nature of the software used to request material, most items move between libraries sharing the same network. Each network is responsible for the shared ILS software that is used to make the request for an item and for this reason, the bulk of the material moves between libraries within the same network.

In the past, each of the six regions comprised one or more such networks. However, in one case, a single automated network (C/W MARS) provided service to two regions (CMRLS and WMRLS). As a result of the automated network configurations, most of the materials that require delivery remains within the network (estimated 95%). Cross-state delivery comprises about 2.9 percent of total volume and delivery to and from non-networked libraries is estimated to be less than two percent. Each region operated or contracted for its own delivery service. Because of the way the material moves within each network, the regional delivery providers tended to sort each networks' material separately.

On July 1, 2010, the six regions merged into a single entity, the Massachusetts Library System, Inc. (MLS). MLS is responsible for all delivery and sorting for all member libraries in Massachusetts. The nine networks (noted above) continue to operate separately and traffic is expected to continue to be heaviest among libraries in a given network.

Table B: Summary of current (pre-July 2010) Regional Sorting, Delivery, and Network Components.

Region	Sorting/Delivery	Automated Network
BRLS	Sorting and delivery handled by courier for delivery. Material shipped between branches of the Boston Public Library (BPL) are handled by BPL staff and are not within the scope of this RFP.	Two networks: FLO (Fenway Libraries Online) Metro-Boston Library Network (MBLC)
CMRLS	Contract for sorting and delivery. In the past CMRLS had its own sorting staff.	part of the C/W MARS network
WMRLS	Sorting done in house at WMRLS HQ in Whately, MA; delivery handled in house also; much sorting is on-board.	part of the C/W MARS network
SEMLS	Contract for sorting and delivery	Three networks: OCLN, CLAMS, and SAILS
NMRLS	Metrowest and NMRLS contract with the same service for sorting and delivery	Two networks: NOBLE and MVLC

Metrowest	Metrowest and NMRLS contract with the same service for sorting and delivery	One network: Minuteman
-----------	---	---------------------------

7 Special Issues

7.1 *Out of Network Items*

In addition to the interlibrary delivery requests made by libraries within the same automated network, a small percentage of other requests are made to libraries outside of the network and/or outside of the region. We call these "out of network items." We estimate that less than two percent of items shipped fall into this category. There are several methods for such loans to be generated, including two online systems that are not currently capable of being integrated into an automated sorting workflow. Items shipped using these two systems, or via other more manual request processes will not fit into an automated sorting work flow.

- MassCAT is a shared Koha ILS run by MLS.
- The Statewide Virtual Catalog is an URSA system run under a state contract
- Many requests are generated by email and telephone requests

MassCat may be developed to become a network capable of automated sorting (Model 1). However at this time, MassCat members are to be considered "out of network" borrowers and lenders. The same is true for the Statewide Virtual Catalog. It may be developed for automated sorting capability. However, for now, traffic generated by this system is to be considered "out of network."

Currently, cross-regional requests account for less than 5% of the interlibrary deliveries. Sorting and delivery of cross-regional material is currently handled by a separate courier service. We ask respondents to address the need for timely delivery between sort sites, if more than one sort site is proposed.

7.2 *Transportation Issues*

A map showing delivery stops as of August 2008 in each region, network affiliation (color-coded) of each stop (if applicable), address, expected number of items delivered per day, expected number of items shipped out per day and distance from Woburn is available for each region on Google Maps. Woburn is being used here as an example because several contractors were located in that city in 2008. This example is not suggesting where respondents might best locate warehouse facilities.

Note that this data is from 2008 and is provided to provide potential contractors with a sense of the scope of the delivery project. Some new locations have added and some have been eliminated and details will likely change again before a new contract is signed.

Please copy these links to your browser's location bar.

BRLS

<http://maps.google.com/maps/ms?ie=UTF8&hl=en&msa=0&msid=103195923948344435907.000454324e118c75850d6&z=10>

CMRLS

<http://maps.google.com/maps/ms?ie=UTF8&hl=en&msa=0&msid=103195923948344435907.00045456ba17207136028&ll=41.724181,-70.683289&spn=1.266853,1.908875&z=9>

Metrowest

<http://maps.google.com/maps/ms?ie=UTF8&hl=en&msa=0&msid=103195923948344435907.00045456dc2097196ff45&z=10>

NMRLS

<http://maps.google.com/maps/ms?ie=UTF8&hl=en&msa=0&msid=103195923948344435907.00045432b60cda1bb1648&z=10>

SEMLS

<http://maps.google.com/maps/ms?ie=UTF8&hl=en&msa=0&msid=103195923948344435907.0004545c4c8e645f5cd2b&ll=41.793952,-70.649065&spn=1.265478,1.908875&z=9>

WMRLS

<http://maps.google.com/maps/ms?ie=UTF8&hl=en&msa=0&msid=103195923948344435907.0004545699d668995f2b7&z=9>

7.3 Unique Delivery Challenges in Massachusetts

Our preference is to outsource the entire delivery and sorting operation in the most efficient manner with minimal degradation of service to libraries. We are willing to entertain proposals for a single sort site and multiple sort sites which meet the mandatory requirements of the RFP.

Massachusetts General Law on employee and independent contractor classification may apply to firms with independent contractors. The Office of the Attorney General (AGO) issues the following Advisory regarding M.G.L. c. 149, s. 148B, the Massachusetts Independent Contractor Law or the Massachusetts Misclassification Law (the “Law”). This Advisory provides guidance with respect to the Attorney General’s understanding of and enforcement of the Law. This Advisory is not a formal opinion. Opinions of the Attorney General are formal documents rendered pursuant to specific statutory authority. M.G.L. c. 12, s. 3, 6, and 9. The Advisory is intended to provide guidance only and does not create any rights or remedies. See:

http://www.mass.gov/?pageID=cagoterminal&L=2&L0=Home&L1=Workplace+Rights&sid=Cago&b=terminalcontent&f=workplace_independent_contractor_advisory&csid=Cago

The Delivery picture is very similar across the state, but there are some unique issues that are present due to geographical issues.

Some stops in the former Southeastern and Western regions are options paid for by libraries under the contract. MLS will collect from the libraries and pay Contractor for all services. See Appendix A: March 2010 Regional Delivery Volume Sample and Routing Schedule Data.

In one region (the Western Massachusetts Regional Library System (WMRLS)) the delivery service is currently handled in-house with customized trucks owned by the region. Sorting is mostly done on the trucks along the route and the rest is done at WMRLS in Whately, Massachusetts. While sorting on the trucks is not generally considered an optimal solution, it is used on these routes because of the relatively light volume of material handled at many locations, the condition of the roads (some are rural, dirt roads) and the distance between libraries. See Appendix E: Consultant's Report for more information. In addition, it may be possible to negotiate the use of a large garage, warehouse space, six vehicles, and several current employees of the MLS who currently perform delivery services in western Massachusetts (see Appendix F: Resources available at Whately, Massachusetts MLS Office).

Many libraries have delivery and sorting provided by a contractor or WMRLS for which the carrier has keys and codes for the majority of libraries. A few libraries have lock boxes, but they are rarely used. A few libraries require delivery during their open hours. Drivers are bonded as many of them handle pick up and drop offs when the libraries are closed. A good number of schools receive delivery as well. Drivers carry keys to many libraries, and that allows flexibility about what time a delivery will take place in those situations. Timing of delivery to libraries that receive daily service is fussier---libraries plan the work schedules of part-time staff and volunteers around their expected delivery time to get the maximum efficiency from their staff. This can also cause disruption when a route needs to be changed due to increased load or added stops.

Many libraries to which we have keys also have security systems that need to be disarmed and rearmed, mostly with codes and in a few cases with keycards. Routes are different from one day of the week to the next so that having a stable library key ring for each route is essential; it would be difficult to be creating a route key ring daily.

The geographical issues in southeastern Massachusetts can provide some challenges. Cape Cod roads are overtaxed during the summer season and that is the time of year that the Cape libraries handle high delivery volumes. Routes often take longer to finish during summer. There is also delivery to the Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket. Both islands (Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket) have libraries that receive delivery five days each week. Boats are used to get the materials to the islands. This means that stops are made at the Patriot Party Boats and Hy-Line Cruises before 10:00 a.m. Bins going to Martha's Vineyard must be waterproof, so are not the "standard delivery bins"; materials going to Nantucket are put into canvas bags as these fit easier into the cargo area. Hy-Line Cruises has an office that holds the bags until the delivery person picks them up; the delivery person on the Vineyard meets the boat as there is no shed to store bins if no one is there to receive them.

Cambridge Public Library's loading area has low clearance and may not accommodate some vehicles.

A number of libraries in the former southeastern region are serviced on Saturdays. The volume of these deliveries must be taken into account in vendor proposals.

Delivery in western Massachusetts covers a large territory, and many of the libraries do not get daily service. The small public libraries that are not part of a network may receive only one or two deliveries per week. Stops are added from time to time as small libraries join the automated network. Two independent academic delivery routes that need a connecting point to statewide delivery in western Massachusetts. The HILC courier delivers to the Whately location, and the CLGS courier connects at Springfield City Library where a courier that's in the employ of MLS swaps materials with them. Springfield is a sort center for the academic libraries of Cooperating Libraries of Greater Springfield, for regional materials and for the branches of Springfield City Library. The materials for branches are options paid for by their main library.

7.4 Labeling

The Consultant's Report provides details about the different labeling procedures in place in each region. While there is a standard template in use statewide, the degree to which the labels are automatically generated versus manually coded depends on the network. See Appendix E: Consultant's Report for further details on labels.

Ideally, the work of labeling individual items for routing purposes would be completely eliminated with Model 1. To do so would require that sorting is accomplished by reading the unique identifier (bar code or RFID) off the individual item and accessing the appropriate network system's software to determine the destination location. Providing such a solution requires the delivery/sorting vendor to make a real-time connection to each of the networks' servers and making use of the SIP2 protocol (information on the SIP2 protocol is available at http://www.aneg-dv.de/allegro/sip2/sip2_developers_guide.pdf) to determine the location (library and branch) to which the item should be delivered. The SIP2 protocol can also be utilized to determine whether the item is being returned to the owning library or being provided to fill a hold by a requesting library.

Currently, the only consistent unique identifier on each individual library item is a bar code label. However, not all bar codes are readily viewable (e.g. on the outside of the item) so some retrospective bar code labeling is likely to be required to offer this solution. In addition, not all library systems are configured to support a SIP2 connection. Updated descriptions of bar codes used in networked libraries is found in Appendix C: Network Survey Data.

One of the most vexing aspects of interlibrary delivery is labeling and sorting. As mentioned above, the software used for making requests of material is the network software. Currently, there are nine separate networks involved in interlibrary delivery (See list above in 1.1, other participants). The network software utilizes a bar code

number for identifying each item requested. Bar codes are generally found on the outside of each CD, DVD, book or multi-part set (but not always). Library staff use the software to identify and track the movement of the material. In some cases, the software is configured to print a routing slip. In other cases, the library staff must append a pre-printed or hand-written routing slip to the items. This is very time consuming.

In the case of out-of-network items, the network cannot provide this information so we expect that some kind of manual system (or workaround) will have to be implemented. The routing labels are used by the sorting personnel to sort individual items into totes which are then delivered to the libraries. Some labels indicate whether the item is being returned to the owning library (returns) or is being provided to fill a request (holds).

RFID tagging is increasingly popular in libraries as an alternative (or supplement) to bar codes. RFID tags make it easier for library staff to perform circulation and materials handling functions and easier for customers to use the self-service check in and check out systems. The tags could also be used to eliminate the use of routing labels and for creating additional tracking opportunities as delivery material moves around the system.

For example, it is possible to write the destination location to the RFID tag as part of the library staff's check-out process. That way, the sorter could read the destination location on the tag and not have to make a SIP2 connection to the network server (see: Appendix C: Network Survey Data). However, at this time, none of the systems write the destination location to an RFID tag and only a very small number of libraries even use RFID tags. Updated descriptions of RFID tags used in networked libraries is found in Appendix C: Network Survey Data.

For these reasons, solutions are sought which can accommodate current and future RFID tagging of materials

Whatever solution is recommended (bar codes, RFID tags, or an alternative system), it will be necessary for some or all of the conversion to occur at the sort center. It may also be required to operate a hybrid system (e.g. bar codes on some libraries' material and RFID tags on others). Beginning in March 2009 bar codes for new items are being placed on the top front left of the cover. The goal is to outsource the tagging process to workers at the sort facility as material moves in and out of the sort center rather than taking on a library-by-library conversion process.

It is extremely likely that any of the approaches will require that items be trapped during sorting so that an external bar code and/or RFID tag can be affixed to the item. How this will be accomplished should be included in the RFP response.

7.5 Packaging

Some of the library material being delivered is more likely to be damaged than others. Books are almost never packaged by libraries but sometimes CDs, DVDs, and magazines are protected with some kind of packaging or bundling. Wrapping a rubberband around five CDs, or placing a CD in a jiffy bag, and even placing a rubberband around a book requires additional staff time and creates ergonomic challenges.

Solutions which eliminate the need for any kind of packaging, bundling, or rubber-banding of delivery material while ensuring that the material is not damaged during sorting and delivery are strongly encouraged.

7.6 *Library Receiving Process*

Material is currently transported in totes. An inventory of existing totes is included in Appendix A: March 2010 Regional Delivery Volume Sample and Routing Schedule Data. Library staff must remove incoming items from the delivery totes and sort them into book carts for distribution throughout the library. Sometimes items delivered to one library must be distributed among that library system's branches. Working with the current totes is awkward, takes up too much space, and is time-consuming. Any solutions that would optimize the process of unpacking totes, or using some kind of tote that could be used to distribute material throughout the library (without unpacking to book carts), or presorting material into totes (e.g. children's picture books, popular DVDs, Branch A returns) are welcome. A primary goal is to reduce the delivery-related workload of library staff.

The library software used by virtually all libraries requires staff to scan the bar code of incoming material. This "checks in" the material to the receiving library. This RFP seeks proposals that eliminate this step or at least create the ability to check-in material in batches via some kind of tote or delivery manifest.

Material that is sent to a library to fill a hold requires the receiving library to generate a Hold Slip. Many libraries have this material behind the circulation desk and pull it for library customers. However, some libraries shelve the Holds publicly so that customers can pull the items for themselves. Items are placed on the shelf with a Hold Slip inside the item. The Hold Slip has the name of the customer or a specified code identifying the customer on it. Items are shelved in alphabetical order by customer name. This self service model is likely to spread because libraries are short-staffed and seeking more self service options. Customers also prefer to self-serve as much as possible.

Some of the networks have automated the printing of Hold Slip upon receiving the item. An even better solution would be to have the Hold Slip placed on or in the item automatically during the sorting process so that this step could be removed from library staff. Solutions for automating the placement of Holds Slips (or some other alternative to labeling items filling such holds) are strongly encouraged. Solutions must incorporate network approved coding to preserve patron privacy, i.e., the patron's name will not be printed

7.7 *Library Access, Delivery Time and Delivery Frequency*

Many of the libraries require that deliveries be made only during open hours. This creates challenges when setting delivery schedules because windows for delivery are short at some locations. It also makes it more likely that delivery vehicles will have more traffic to deal with. Some libraries allow lobby access during closed hours. Most libraries receive weekday delivery but not weekend delivery. Holiday weekends are always problematic due to the high volume of online requests that come in (customers can request material 24/7, 365 days a year regardless of each library's open hours).

Library staffing schedules are coordinated with delivery times. Staff are scheduled for processing incoming material so that it can be quickly moved out of totes and onto the library shelves. Most libraries have very little workspace to spare so it is important to quickly get the material out of the back rooms. It is also important to provide quick turnaround for library customers who expect materials to be available for pick-up within 24 hours of the item being sent from another library.

Proposals that provide for quick delivery turnaround times (next delivery day turnaround or better) while reducing the volume of material that is delivered at any one time while taking into account library staffing needs are strongly encouraged. We are interested in vendor ideas.

7.8 *Sorting Issues*

Five regions contract with a vendor to do sorting and delivery. Recent assessments indicate that sorting accuracy is very good (99.39% with item sorting and 99.5 tote delivery accuracy).

Item level sorting is done in a variety of ways depending on the region. Delivery tote labeling is also done differently in each region. Please see the Consultant's Report for detailed descriptions of each region's sorting and labeling practices. Appendix C in Appendix E: Consultant's Report includes images of all the routing labels used statewide.

The goal is to reach 99.9% accuracy for item level sorting and 99.9% accuracy for tote delivery while eliminating or significantly reducing the workload associated with the various routing labels in use around the state.

7.9 *Pricing Issues*

The solutions provided must demonstrate cost effectiveness over time while improving service quality, reducing the workload, and improving ergonomics for library staff.

We anticipate adding new libraries to the system which may or may not be part of an existing network and we anticipate libraries will migrate from one ILS to another. We also expect delivery volume to fluctuate over time and throughout the year.

Flexible yet simple pricing models are strongly encouraged.

7.10 *Future Volume*

Rather than reducing the demand for library material, the Internet and network enhancements have created opportunities for increasing resource-sharing between libraries and increasing service level expectations of library users. Customers expect it to be easy to discover and request material (from anywhere in Massachusetts) and they expect to be able to have it delivered promptly. These demands continue to put pressure on libraries to make improvements in their software and interlibrary delivery services.

Interlibrary delivery volume has risen steadily over the last several years as libraries

respond to the demands with easier-to-use software and more efficient services. This steady increase is expected to continue over the next several years (at least). While the prospect of downloadable and streaming content may eventually slow and perhaps reverse this trend. The timeframe for such changes is not predictable. According to network reports, delivery volume increased 12.6% from fy2008-fy2009; and 28.5% from fy2009-fy2010. Fy2010 saw record use of library services as the national economic crisis brought patrons in. For detailed network volume data, see Appendix B.

7.11 Future Changes in Materials Movement

As noted earlier, the automated network software currently in use creates a pattern of materials movement that is network centric; material generally moves between libraries that are part of the same automated network. New software is being developed that makes resource-sharing outside of the current networks more likely. As a result, sorting solutions that cannot be modified to account for dramatically different patterns of materials movement around the state are not suitable.

7.12 General Information

- 7.12.1 The Massachusetts Library System, Inc. (MLS) wishes to obtain proposals for the entire delivery service. Delivery service under this proposal will begin July 1, 2011. Respondents should indicate preference for contract term on the Response Form.
- 7.12.2 MLS will not be responsible for any costs incurred by a bidder in preparing and submitting a proposal in response to this request.
- 7.12.3 Any information which may have been released either orally or in writing prior to the issuance of this request shall be deemed preliminary and bind neither MLS nor the Contractor.
- 7.12.4 MLS may cancel this proposal in whole or in part at any time.
- 7.12.5 MLS retains the right to award this proposal in whole or in part or to choose not to make and award.
- 7.12.6 MLS reserves the right to increase and/or decrease frequency of stops, or eliminate stops, as deemed necessary by budget cuts or other constraints.
- 7.12.7 MLS shall have a reasonable opportunity to inspect all service performed by, work produced and facilities of the Contractor. Before a contract is signed MLS must have the opportunity to inspect Contractor's facilities and to inspect periodically through the duration of the contract.
- 7.12.8 The Contractor is retained solely for the purposes of and to the extent set forth in the proposal. Contractor's relationship to MLS during the term of this contract shall be that of an independent contractor.
- 7.12.9 Contractor is responsible for having all insurance, licenses, permits, etc. which may apply to this type of service.
- 7.12.10 Certificates of Insurance must be filed with MLS before any vehicle performs delivery under this agreement. Annual renewals of insurance must be filed with MLS as they occur.
- 7.12.11 Any appeal of decisions made related to this proposal are subject to the process designated by MLS's Executive Board.
- 7.12.12 MLS prefers the Contractor to have employees who perform delivery. Due to the geographical nature of the area, we realize that this may not be possible for the entire area. Thus, if any part of the work under this proposal is to be performed by a subcontractor, the bidder will provide a complete description of services to be subcontracted along with a complete description of qualifications and capabilities and equipment capacity of the subcontractor. No subcontractor may be used unless the bidder has submitted the above in writing. We reserve the right to approve or disapprove any and all such subcontractors and to revoke any approval previously given.
- 7.12.13 MLS reserves the right to reject any proposal which, in our judgment, fails to meet the requirements of this proposal or which is incomplete, conditional, or obscure; or which contains additions or deletions not called for, erasures, alterations, or other irregularities; or in which errors occur.
- 7.12.14 MLS reserves the right to waive discrepancies or permit a responder to clarify such discrepancies and so conduct discussions with all qualified responders in any manner necessary to serve the best interests of MLS. MLS reserves the right to award a contract based on written proposals received without prior discussions or negotiations.

7.12.15 Final acceptance of a proposal will be based on all information from the response form, attachments, and subsequent communications with responders.

8 Submission Procedures

8.1 Instructions for Responding to this RFP

8.1.1 Who May Respond

Responses are welcome from potential vendors or service providers. Our preference is to contract with a single organization for all services included in this RFP.

How to Respond

Please send written proposals and accompanying information, in sealed envelopes that clearly identify the party submitting the proposal. Please attach an original signature to the proposal. Send to:

MLS Library Delivery and Sorting RFP/2010-07-15
Massachusetts Library System, Inc.
135 Beaver Street
Waltham, MA 02452

Electronic submissions should be emailed to rfp@masslibsystem.org

We recommend that proposals be formatted in such a way that it is easy to copy them for electronic distribution to our Task Force and other stakeholders for review.

8.2 Deadlines: see page 1

Proposals may be changed or withdrawn prior to the due date by submission of such change in writing in a sealed envelope, identifying the submitting party and indicating that it contains a correction of the proposal for delivery service.

8.3 Questions Regarding this RFP

Any questions regarding this RFP should be sent in at the July 29, 2010 meeting or in writing by the deadline listed on page 1 to: rfp@masslibsystem.org

You must include full contact information with your question. Contact information will not be shared with other potential respondents, however, questions and answers will be shared to ensure that all potential respondents have access to the same information. These answers will be posted at: <http://www.masslibsystem.org>.

8.4 Other Communications

Other communication regarding this RFP should be directed to:
rfp@massachusettslibrarysystem.org.

8.5 Proposal Pricing and Billing Conditions (see Response Form: Section 12: About Pricing).

MLS prefers an all-inclusive pricing schedule that covers delivery and sorting, is based on a base fee, and that is payable on a weekly, quarterly, or monthly basis. If the respondent includes other factors for pricing adjustments based on thresholds of volume, stops, and/or fuel costs, please include them in your pricing schedule. Provide details of how pricing factors are measured and monitored and caps related to each pricing factor.

8.5.1 Annual Cost of Service.

Provide a base cost for the service based on the data provided in this RFP. In addition, provide a schedule of conditions (e.g. number of stops, number of items, number of locations, performance measurements) that will result in price increases or price decreases and describe how these conditions will be measured. Describe any surcharges that will apply.

8.5.2 Payment Calendar

Provide a calendar showing payment schedules and when price adjustments will be made.

- A. The successful Contractor will be required to comply with all of the provisions stipulated in these Contract Specifications. The Contractor's bid proposal shall state what the cost will be for each stop-off point on the listed route schedule, as well as the weekly, monthly and annual cost of the route.

B. The successful Contractor's pricing proposal must include:

1. Base costs for initial contract term and for subsequent contract term.
2. Penalties and incentives for meeting or failing to meet performance guarantees.
3. All cost variables and thresholds for triggering variables, e.g., number, location, and frequency of stops; fuel costs; on-demand stops not on the regular schedule; on-demand stops within the regular schedule; volume and characteristics of library materials shipped by libraries; and all cost variables for holidays and emergency situations.
4. Costs for providing bar code duplication/application services as required at the sort site. (Model 1)

8.5.3 Optional Services

1. All cost variables for providing services for delivery to library branches that are not part of the the regular schedule. For example, there are currently 7 stops at branches in the SEMLS schedule in four communities; and eight stops in the WMRLS schedule in a single community. These stops are paid for by the library under the contract with MLS.
2. The Contractor should provide information for on-demand service to those members that are not on a delivery route, but may need delivery from time to time. Contractor must provide information as to the possibility of such an arrangement and the cost per stop to provide this service.
3. Other optional services, e.g., finer sorting for existing locations; additional services for individual libraries.
4. The Contractor shall be responsible for the payment of all transportation charges including but not limited to the following: compensation, vehicle lease or purchase, insurance and liability of any type, fuel, maintenance and repair, traffic fines, parking fees and fines, and tolls for the use of any bridge, ferry, highway or tunnel.

9 Responsibility

9.1 Contractor Responsibility

- 9.1.1 Contractor shall be responsible for any damage done by any vehicle used under this Contract, to any person, corporation, or other entity or property and shall hold MLS harmless for any of this damage. Contractor must insure MLS on their policy against such damage.
- 9.1.2 The Contractor shall be responsible for the care and handling of materials. Materials are to be protected from inclement weather and are to be handled with care. Materials are not to be contained in open or unlocked vehicles.
- 9.1.3 The Contractor is liable for the typical library replacement costs of materials lost in the delivery system. Lost items must be paid for within six (6) months.
- 9.1.4 The Contractor will be held liable for damage to materials for which there is proof of negligence on the part of the drivers and/or sorters or physical evidence of damage. This includes wet and damaged items. Damage claims must be resolved within one month. MLS will discuss this issue with the contractor during negotiations.
- 9.1.5 Contractor warrants that it uses due diligence in the selection and supervision of its employees including, but not limited to, insuring that its employees have integrity, professionalism, responsibility, and competence as drivers. Contractor covenants that it will continue to exercise such due diligence in the selection and supervision of its employees during the term of this Contract.
- 9.1.6 Contractor warrants that there are no actions or claims pending or threatened against Contractor, or any officer, director, employee, agent or affiliate of Contractor.
- 9.1.7 The Contractor must accept the claim procedure form provided by MLS.
- 9.1.8 Contractor maintains valid policies of workers' compensation, unemployment insurance, liability insurance and vehicle insurance. Contractor provides MLS with copies of policies.
- 9.1.9 The contractor may not use subcontractors to perform the services without the prior written consent of MLS.
- 9.1.10 The contractor will provide MLS with the names of the drivers and sorters.
- 9.1.11 The contractor must notify MLS of any changes within this contract, such as a change of location of the sort facility or change of managers of this contract. This notification shall be in writing.
- 9.1.12 If a driver has a problem with a member library, the driver should notify the contractor who would then notify MLS who will act as the liaison between the member library and the contractor.
- 9.1.13 The contractor must notify MLS if any route is delayed one hour or more of its first scheduled stop.
- 9.1.14 The contractor must notify MLS if route is not to be completed or will run one hour or more behind schedule.

9.2 *MLS Responsibility*

- 9.2.1 MLS will notify the contractor of issues regarding drivers, sorting or any unforeseen circumstances.
- 9.2.2 MLS will be the liaison between the contractor and the libraries for significant issues.
- 9.2.3 MLS will keep a log of all significant communication between members and/or contractor.
- 9.2.4 MLS will determine the number and timing of member surveys for delivery volume and turnaround time. Results of the surveys will be provided to the contractor.
- 9.2.5 MLS will process payment for delivery service twice a month.

9.3 *Motor Vehicle Liability and Other Insurance*

- 9.3.1 The Contractor shall at all times maintain motor vehicle liability insurance, satisfactory to MLS on all vehicles used in carrying out the work to be performed.
- 9.3.2 The Contractor will at all times maintain and keep in force a policy of general liability insurance for each vehicle being used to provide library delivery services of \$1,000,000/\$2,000,000 for personal injury, automobile insurance of \$1,000,000 and \$3,000,000 for property damage. Certificates of this insurance should be filed with MLS before any vehicle performs delivery services under the agreement. Insurance coverage should also cover other means of transportation, including boat, if other means are needed to fulfill this proposal. This coverage should be similar to the levels to other insurance.
- 9.3.3 Simultaneously with the execution of the contract, the Contractor shall provide MLS with the policies, binders or certificates evidencing that the required insurance is in full force and effect. Failure of the Contractor to provide and continue in force such insurance shall be deemed a material breach of the contract and shall operate as an immediate termination thereof at MLS's option. Renewal copies of these policies, binders or certificates must be provided to MLS or the contractor shall be deemed in violation of the contract.
- 9.3.4 The contractor should maintain other comprehensive and/or umbrella policy to indemnify MLS from all claims, losses, expenses, damages and liabilities brought against them in connection with the Contractor's performance of its services under this agreement.
- 9.3.5 The Contractor shall maintain insurance to cover the eventuality that all library materials in the possession of the Contractor at facilities, on vehicles, or in possession of a subcontractor are lost due to an accident, fire, or any other catastrophe.
- 9.3.6 All policies shall provide MLS thirty (30) day notice of cancellation, non-renewal, or material change

10 Evaluation Criteria Checklist

- 10.1.1 Please address all the criteria listed on the appropriate (Model 1 or Model 2) Respondent Form in your written proposal. You do not have to limit your proposal to only these criteria; and should consider the entire proposal in your response.
- 10.1.2 Provide a separate response for each Model you are responding to, should you choose to respond to both Models.
- 10.1.3 Proposals will be rated based on how well responses correspond with MLS needs. Some questions will be weighted more heavily than others to reflect their importance to the delivery program.