



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

October 1, 2010

To: John Szerlag, City Manager

From: Mark F. Miller, Acting Assistant City Manager/Economic Development Services
Susan A. Leirstein, Purchasing Director
Steven Pallotta, Director of Building Operations
Zachary Branigan LEED AP, Consultant

Subject: Standard Purchasing Resolution 8: Best Value Award – Energy Audits

Background

On July 22, 2010, Statements of Qualifications (SOQ) were received to qualify energy professionals to perform energy efficiency audits for eleven (11) municipal buildings in the City of Troy. One-Hundred Forty-Four (144) companies were notified via the Michigan Intergovernmental Trade Network (MITN) website with four (4) proposals received. Two companies were disqualified; one for not providing the Sample document(s) as requested, and the other for failing to meet insurance specifications. The two (2) remaining companies met the minimum qualifications and were interviewed.

A committee consisting of Mark Miller, Acting Assistant City Manager/Economic Development Services; Steven Pallotta, Director of Building Operations, and Zachary Branigan, Consultant with Carlisle/Wortman Associates were the raters for the entire best value process.

After the interviews, a Detailed Pricing Proposal was requested and received from the two remaining firms on September 22, 2010. Based on the scoring criteria for the statement of qualifications, interview, detailed proposal and pricing analysis, the committee recommends awarding the contract to the highest rated respondent, Energy Finance Analytics of Lansing, Michigan. (see Executive Summary attached)

Recommendation

City management recommends awarding a contract to Energy Finance Analytics of Lansing, as a result of a best value process to complete the energy audits for eleven (11) municipal buildings in the City of Troy, which will include data collection, analysis and energy simulation, then report results for an estimated total cost of \$39,840.00 to be completed within three (3) months of contract execution.

Award is contingent upon the recommended bidder's submission of properly executed contract and proposal documents, including insurance certificates and all other specified requirements.

Fund Availability

Funds are available in the Building Operations capital fund for buildings and improvements and reimbursed through the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG) Program.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ENERGY AUDIT SERVICES

STATISTICS:

- ◆ **One Hundred Forty-Four (144) entities were notified via the MITN e-procurement website**
- ◆ **Four (4) statements of qualifications were received.**
- ◆ **Two (2) organizations met the pass/fail criteria**
- ◆ **Both remaining organizations were interviewed**
- ◆ **Energy Finance Analytics is being recommended as the result of a best value process.**

The following two (2) firms received the indicated final scores as a result of the statement of qualifications, interview, detailed proposal and pricing criteria.

Organization	SCORE
Energy Finance Analytics	167.67
AKT Peerless	162.07

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS – ORGANIZATIONS ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION (BASED ON PASS/FAIL MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS)

- EAM Engineering
- Madison Electric / Standard Group

STATEMENT OF NO INTEREST

- None

Attachments:

- ✓ Weighted Final Scoring Includes Statement of Qualifications, Interview, Detailed Proposal and Pricing Score
- ✓ Evaluation Process
- ✓ Original Tabulation



WEIGHTED FINAL SCORING
Energy Audit Services

Final Score Calculation:

$$\begin{array}{r}
 20\% \text{ SOQ Score} \\
 30\% \times \text{Interview Score} \\
 50\% \times \text{Detailed Price Proposal Score} \\
 100\% \hspace{15em} = \text{Final Weighted Score}
 \end{array}$$

NOTE: In order to equate the price to the weighted evaluation process scoring, the prices had to be converted into a score with the base of 200.

Each City Committee member independently used a weighted score sheet to evaluate the Statement of Qualifications; and each Committee Member calculated a weighted score. The scores of the Committee Members were averaged into one score for each organization for each phase of the process. Only the most qualified organizations were invited to participate in an interview.

Phase 2

Weighted Average Score for Statement of Qualification Evaluation: 20%

RATERS	1	2	3	Average	Final Weighted Score (x .20)
Vendors:					
AKT Peerless	200	180	200	193	38.67
Energy Finance Analytics	105	130	195	143	28.67

Phase 3

Weighted Average Score for Interview: 30%

RATERS	1	2	3	Average	Final Weighted Score (x .30)
Vendors:					
AKT Peerless	186	200	198	195	58.40
Energy Finance Analytics	112	156	175	148	44.30

Phase 4

Weighted Average Score for Detailed Proposal: 20%

RATERS	1	2	3	Average	Final Weighted Score (x .20)
Vendors:					
AKT Peerless	76	156	162	131	26.3
Energy Finance Analytics	164	172	184	173	34.7

Weighted Average Score for Price: 30%

RATERS	Weighted Criteria - Difference in Costs {1-(Proposal Price-low price/low price) x Available Points}	Final Weighted Score (x .30)
Vendors:		
AKT Peerless	{1-(54,000-39,840/39,840) x 200}	38.70
Energy Finance Analytics	{1-(39,840-39,840/39,840) x 200}	60.0



FINAL SCORE:

VENDORS:	AKT Peerless	Energy Finance Analytics
SOQ Score	38.67	28.67
Interview Score	58.40	44.30
Detailed Proposal Score	26.30	34.70
Pricing Score	38.70	60.0
FINAL SCORE	162.07	167.67

G:/Purchasing/QBS Documents/SOQ-COT 10-17 Energy Audits/Executive Summary -Energy Audits Services - WeightedRatingSummary 8.10.doc



SELECTION PROCESS

SECTION 4: CRITERIA FOR SELECTION ENERGY AUDITS

Page 1 of 1

A City Committee of three (3) individuals will review the proposals. The City of Troy reserves the right to negotiate a final contract (pending City Council approval) with the most qualified firm(s) based upon a combination of factors including but not limited to the following:

- A. Compliance with qualifications criteria
- B. Completeness of the SOQ
- C. Financial strength of the firm
- D. Correlation of the SOQ submitted to the needs of the City of Troy
- E. Any other factors which may be deemed to be in the City's best interest
- F. Evaluation Process

Phase 1: Minimum Qualifications Evaluation (Pass/Fail)

Firms will be required to meet minimum established criteria in order to go to the second phase of the process. (Evaluation Sheet Proposal)

Phase 2: Statement of Qualifications Evaluation

Each City Committee member will independently use a weighted score sheet to evaluate the Statement of Qualifications; each Committee Member will calculate a weighted score. The scores of the Committee Members will be averaged into one score for each firm for this phase of the process.

Phase 3: Interview Score

Based on the scores from the Statement of Qualifications – Phase 2, only the most qualified firms will be invited to participate in an interview. Each City Committee member will independently use a weighted score sheet to evaluate the Interview; each Committee Member will calculate a weighted score. The scores of the Committee Members will be averaged into one score for each firm for this phase of the process. Those being interviewed may be supplied with further instructions and requests prior to the interview. Persons representing the firm at the interview must be the personnel who will be assigned to this project. **Only the top-rated firms will be asked to provide a Detailed Proposal as outlined in Phase 4.**

Phase 4: Detailed Proposals

The Detailed Proposals will include the following information, at a minimum:

- a. Complete firm, fixed price, proposal for all services / deliverables..
- b. Include overhead costs.
- c. Note all reimbursable costs.
- d. Cost plus a percentage is not acceptable.

Phase 5: Final Scoring and Selection – based on scoring from Phase 3 and Phase 4

The firm(s) with the highest final weighted score(s) will be recommended to the Troy City Council for Award. The final weighted score shall be based on:

20% SOQ Score
30% x Interview Score
50% x Detailed Proposal Score
100% = Final Weighted Score

Base points = 200

Note: The City of Troy reserves the right to change the order or eliminate an evaluation phase if deemed in the City's best interest to do so.

Opening Date -- 9/22/10
 Date Reviewed -- 9/22/10

CITY OF TROY
 TABULATION
 ENERGY AUDITS

FIRM NAME:

Energy Finance Analytics, LLC	AKT Peerless Environmental & Energy Services

PROPOSAL: TO PROVIDE ENERGY AUDITS FOR THE CITY OF TROY

FOUR (4) COPIES (Yes or No)	Y	Y
COMPLETION SCHEDULE (Yes or No) Can Meet	Y	Y
PROJECT WORK PLAN / TIMELINE (Yes or No) Attached	Y Appendix C: Timeline	N Blank
STATEMENT OF WORK (Yes or No) Attached	Y Appendix A	Y Appendix B

COST PROPOSAL:

	COMPLETE FOR SUM OF	COMPLETE FOR SUM OF
CITY HALL	\$ 11,200.00	\$ 20,000.00
DPW GARAGE	\$ 7,600.00	\$ 7,000.00
FIRESTATION #1	\$ 1,320.00	\$ 2,500.00
FIRESTATION #2	\$ 1,220.00	\$ 2,500.00
FIRESTATION #3	\$ 1,900.00	\$ 2,500.00
FIRESTATION #4	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 2,500.00
FIRESTATION #5	\$ 1,100.00	\$ 2,500.00
FIRESTATION #6	\$ 1,100.00	\$ 2,500.00
NATURE CENTER	\$ 2,300.00	\$ 2,500.00
LIBRARY	\$ 7,200.00	\$ 5,500.00
POLICE/FIRE TRAINING CNT	\$ 3,900.00	\$ 4,000.00
GRAND TOTAL:	\$ 39,840.00	\$ 54,000.00

HOURLY RATE FEE SCHEDULED (Yes or No) Attached	Y Appendix B: Hourly Rates	Y Appendix A
--	-------------------------------	-----------------

PAYMENT TERMS:	Net 30 Days	Monthly Billing
EXCEPTIONS:	N/A	Blank
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: Signed Y or N	Y	Y

ATTEST:
 Diane Fisher
 Susan Leirstein
 Julie Hamilton

 Susan Leirstein CPPO CPPB
 Purchasing Director

Opening Date -- 7/22/10
 Date Reviewed --7-22-10

CITY OF TROY
 TABULATION
 ENERGY AUDITS

FIRM NAME:

EAM	Madison	AKT Peerless	Energy
Engineering	Electric/Standard	Environmental	Finance
	Group	& Energy Services	Analytics

PROPOSAL: TO PROVIDE ENERGY AUDITS FOR ELEVEN CITY BUILDINGS FOR THE CITY OF TROY

FOUR (4) COPIES	(Yes or No)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Samples of Similar Energy Audit projects (Y or N)		No	Yes	Yes	Yes
INSURANCE:	Can Meet	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Cannot Meet				
	Signed Y or N	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
INDEMNIFICATION CLAUSE:	Y or N	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
EXTENSION OF AWARD TO MITN PURCHASING COOP:Y/N		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
EXCEPTIONS:		Blank	Blank	Blank	Blank
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: Signed	Y or N	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
TWO FORMS: Non-Collusion & Legal Status:	Y/N	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ADDENDUM #1 Attached:	Y or N	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

 Susan Leirstein CPPO CPPB
 Purchasing Director

ATTEST:

 Debra A Doyle

 Steve Pallotta

 Linda Bockstanz