Item No. 5A

# CITY OF FLAGSTAFF
## STAFF SUMMARY REPORT

**To:** The Honorable Mayor and Council

**From:** Ann Marie Fisher, Sr. Procurement Specialist
Purchasing

**Date:** November 9, 2010

**Meeting Date:** November 16, 2010

---

**TITLE:** Consideration of Proposals: Program Advocate – Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy

**RECOMMENDED ACTION: Reject all proposals and authorize staff to re-advertise the RFP for services**

---

**ACTION SUMMARY:**

- Policy Decision or Reason for Action: Efficiency
  - The original RFP was for the services of a Program Advocate for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy
  - Reason for Action – No qualified proposals were received
  - Decision Points:
    - Determine whether or not RFP submittals are qualified to provide services.
- Financial Impact:
  - This project is funded by a grant from Living Communities
- Connection to Council Goal: Sustainable Community
- Options:
  - ~~Award RFP to one of the RFP respondents~~. Accept the two (2) proposal responses as submitted and award the service contract to the higher scoring firm. This option would award the contract to an unqualified individual/firm, and the Scope of Services of the RFP would ~~most likely~~ not be met.
  - Reject ~~all RFPs~~ the two (2) proposal responses and re-advertise the RFP, ~~for services~~ .while expanding outreach and advertising to attract qualified Proposers for these services. This option would provide the City with the services ~~that~~ we are seeking and use the grant money responsibly.
  - Reject the two (2) proposals and not re-advertise the RFP. This option would forego the grant money that has been awarded to the City.
- Has there been a previous Council decision on this topic? Yes

Barbara Goodrich

**Division Director** ***(Acknowledgment that all reviews have been completed and required approvals initialed below.)***

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:**

**Background/History:** In October 2010, a Request for Proposal (RFP) was sent out for the services of a Program Advocate for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. Two proposals were received; one (1) from an individual by the name of Steve Arras and one (1) from a company by the name of Porteco, Inc. ~~and they were evaluated on the following criteria~~: The evaluation criteria outlined in the RFP document are as follows: Previous Experience, Approach and Planned Strategy to provide services, References and Cost of Services. The RFP Scope of Work clearly explained that the city was looking for an individual/firm that could identify long-term funding mechanisms for residential energy efficiency and renewable energy and market transformation, as well as other duties. Both proposals lacked experience in funding sources and did not give any justification that they could provide loan opportunities. City staff feel, that if we can broaden our outreach and advertising when sending out this proposal a second time, we could reach an audience that is qualified and experienced in the services being sought.

**Key Considerations:** Two proposals were received; neither individual/firm is qualified to handle the Scope of Work.

**Community Benefits and Considerations:** This grant project will benefit the community in many ways related to energy efficiency and renewable energy.

**Community Involvement:** N/A

**Financial Implications:** There is no financial implication to the city except for additional City staff hours in re-advertising and re-evaluating new proposals.

**Options and Alternatives**:

~~1. Re-advertise the proposal, expand outreach and advertising to reach a larger group of participants.~~
~~2. Not award the project, and not re-advertise for new proposals. This decision would forego the grant money that has been awarded to the City, and City staff does not recommend going this route.~~

1. Accept the two (2) proposal responses as submitted and award the service contract to the higher scoring firm. This option would award the contract to an unqualified individual/firm, and the Scope of Services of the RFP would not be met.
2. Reject the two (2) proposal responses and re-advertise the RFP, while expanding outreach and advertising to attract qualified Proposers for these services. This option would provide the City with the services we are seeking and use the grant money responsibly.
3. Reject the two (2) proposals and not re-advertise the RFP. This option would forego the grant money that has been awarded to the City.

**Attachments**:

- N/A

| INITIALS | RESPONSIBILITY | DATE | INITIALS | RESPONSIBILITY | DATE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| [signature] | BIDS/PURCHASES | 11/9/10 | | FINANCE/BUDGET | |
| SBK | GRANTS | 11/9/10 | | CONTRACTS | |
| DW | LEGAL | 11/9/10 | | IGAS | |
| RCS | SEMS/PW | 11/9/10 | | | |

DATE OF COUNCIL APPROVAL:_____