

## **20% Building Energy Savings Analysis RFP – Questions & Answers**

March 12, 2012

Below are questions and answers received during the Pre-Submittal Conference and by email and phone regarding the 20% Building Energy Savings Analysis Request for Proposals. Due to the various means of submitting and answering questions, there were many redundant or duplicate questions; as such, most duplication was not included in this document. Please note that questions are not listed in a strategic or particular order.

### **RFP Pre-Submittal Conference**

#### **Why is the City looking for an on-call contract to do this work?**

FAS is proposing an on-call contract for energy management services for two main reasons:

- 1) We have yet to audit a FAS owned and managed building to determine whether a specific energy savings target is feasible, and as such would like to move forward with one audit initially to see how successful it may be.
- 2) Because funding for audits will be coming from our operating budget, any cuts to the budget could impact funding for the audits. If funding is available and the first audit is satisfactory, then we will move forward with auditing the remaining buildings. If only partial funding is available, we may audit one or two buildings per year.

#### **How immediately will you move forward with assessing a building?**

The plan is to move forward with auditing one of the buildings once the consultant is selected and the contract is agreed upon. Because this is an on-call contract, typically when ready to assess a building, we will ask the consultant to request a proposal with a cost estimate and proposed schedule for assessing the building. Once the proposal is received and accepted, we will send a Letter of Authorization or Notice to Proceed. Once the Notice to Proceed is received by the consultant, the initial steps will likely be to gather information and beginning scheduling the site walk.

#### **Have you had environmental studies conducted, such as to identify asbestos, on all the buildings included in Table 3?**

Based on available information, some level of environmental study was performed on Haller Lake Vehicle Maintenance, and reports (1994 & 1996) indicate some floor tile and mastic to be asbestos. The other buildings appear not to have had environmental studies conducted.

#### **How much of the scope will be water related?**

The scope is specifically focused on energy only. The consultant will be expected to identify measure that improve energy efficiency or reduce energy consumption of water systems (e.g., hot water pipe insulation).

#### **Is there a reason why Table 3 includes the total square feet, energy use, energy costs, etc. relative to the buildings listed for analysis?**

The information regarding FAS's entire portfolio was provided largely for proposers to understand the percent of energy consumption the proposed buildings represent compared to the total portfolio usage.

**Why not utilize Energy Savings Performance Contract (ESPC) for this work?**

The scope of the RFP is very analytically focused in that we are hoping to determine if 20% energy savings is feasible, and if so, how much it may cost FAS to achieve. We are not looking for the guaranteed energy savings and/or guaranteed maximum pricing typical of ESPCs. Furthermore, in the case of this work, we may not have the funding to move forward with the measures that are identified during the assessment/analysis; typically when we utilize the ESCO we have them assess buildings to identify guaranteed energy savings and maximum costs for particular Facility Improvement Measures that we would implement in the near future. Lastly, for this analysis we anticipate that the approach to achieving such savings will need to be holistic, and therefore will have to identify behavioral change measures, no- to low-cost measures, capital measures, etc. Based on experience to-date with the City's ESCO, project scopes and resulting measures have focused more on capital measures, with the exception of retro-commissioning.

**What is meant by assessing exiting structural, mechanical, and electrical components and systems in the third bullet in Section 1. Purpose and Background?**

It basically means assessing any building system that impacts energy use, ranging from glazing or double pane windows to the Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning system to the lighting system of a building.

**How comprehensive is building documentation, such as operating schedules?**

The level of comprehensiveness will depend on the building and the specific documentation. For instance, some building systems are controlled by Building Automation Systems (BAS) and some are controlled by pneumatic, so for building without BAS's it may be harder to obtain the operating schedules. Additionally we may not have up-to-date As Builts for all the buildings in Table 3. As a result of the variability of current documentation for buildings, a caveat was added to the scope of work indicating that the best effort should be made to obtain the most up-to-date information.

**Does the impact to tenants need to be taken into consideration when identifying energy conservation measures and costs?**

The goal of this effort is to identify all measures that can/will achieve a 20% energy savings, regardless of impact to tenants or cost effectiveness. Granted, if a measure will have a significant impact to tenants and therefore impact the cost of the measure due to relocation, this is information we need to know and take into consideration when determining which efforts are feasible (financially, logistically, etc.) to implement.

**Are the buildings in Table 3 the buildings that will be assessed, how did you determine which buildings to assess, and are you hoping to apply measures for each building type (e.g., fire stations) to other buildings of that type?**

The list provided represents the amount of square footage and type of buildings that would be assessed under the on-call energy management services contract. At the moment, the specific buildings listed are the buildings that will be assessed. If we decide to assess a different building, then we will choose a building that is similar to the one that we are not assessing. The buildings selected were selected based on several variables, including their portion of total portfolio energy use, energy performance, system complexity, age, etc. Ideally, measures that are identified for a building type can be applied to other similar buildings.

**In Table 3, what building is HLF FFD VGM (A)?**

HLF FFD VGM is the Vehicle Maintenance facility located on our Haller Lake Facilities campus. Approximately half of the building is utilized by our Fleets Division to repair a variety of City vehicles, a quarter of the facility is office space, and the last quarter of the facility is break room and locker room space.

**Can you define WMBE?**

WMBE stands for Women and Minority Businesses. To be a WMBE, 51% of the business needs to be owned by a woman or minority. For this project, we are interested in learning how you might include WMBEs if you are taking a team approach for this work. Please see Section 8. Response Format, bullet 5 for additional information re: our interest in WMBEs. Also please see the <http://seattle.gov/purchasing/wmbe.htm> page for additional information about WMBEs and contracting.

**Can fees escalate or be adjusted over the four year contract period? How will fee schedules work for on-call contracts?**

It is up to the proposer to provide the fee schedule and any escalation of fees and legitimate justification for the escalation over the four year period in the RFP submittal. Once a consultant is selected and under contract with the City, the consultant may request that the City consider proposed new pricing based on demonstrated changes in the consultant's operational costs. As for how fees work in on-call contracts, FAS will ask the consultant to provide a cost estimate for assessing a particular building, which will include a breakout of staff hours and fees (based on the agreed to fee schedule) and project schedule. If approved, a Notice to Proceed or Letter of Authorization will be issued.

**Questions via Email**

**Is the "project estimate" regarding an energy audit itself? Or is it speaking toward the cost estimates / overall project cost to reduce those energy reduction measures?**

The not to exceed value of \$250,000 is the maximum amount of funding for conducting building energy assessments on a handful of buildings over the four year contract period. The funding will not fund installation/construction projects to reduce energy use.

**Is this a follow up contract to a previously contracted scope of work? If so, who holds that contract, and did that consultant prepare the scope of work for this contract?**

No. FAS prepared the scope based on previous FAS building energy audits.

**Is the project fully funded over the five year term, or does funding need to be re-approved each year?**

Because the funding for this work comes from the Facility Operations Division's annual operating budget, it does not need to be approved annually.

**Can you please provide more information on how the Energy Use Index was generated: how was it calculated, and what is the measure unit: e.g. 64 Energy Use/Square Feet – kBTU/SF?**

The units are MBtu/SF. Generally Energy Use Index (EUI) is energy use divided by square feet. To be clearer, a new Table 3 with 2008 data, which is the City's energy baseline year, replaced the original table in Section 5 Scope of Work.

**Can you please provide more information on how the Cost Index Average was generated: how it was calculated and what is the measure unit: e.g. \$1.04 per what? /SF?**

Energy cost divided by square feet. Unit is \$/SF.

**Please describe the metric “use type energy use index” shown as the 7<sup>th</sup> column in the table - how was it calculated, and what is the measure unit?**

The use type EUI is the average EUI for that type of building. For instance, Seattle Municipal Tower, City Hall, and Justice Center make up the Civic Campus (a.k.a., our administrative buildings) and each building’s EUI is calculated and then all three are averaged to determine the EUI of the Civic Campus. We use it to generally identify how a building performs compared to other similar buildings.

**Table 3 only lists examples of buildings being considered for audits. Can you provide the details of the entire portfolio which makes up the 4,076,630 square feet so that an accurate quote can be provided?**

The list provided represents the amount of square footage and type of buildings that would be assessed under the on-call energy management services contract. We are looking for a specific quote and proposed project schedule for assessing/analyzing fire station 25, and in general, your hourly rate structure, overhead, markups, etc. (see Section 8. Response Format for details).

**Is the requirement for a Washington State Engineering License strict as regards to state of licensure?**

No. As such, the RFP, specifically the minimum qualifications section, was revised to say "or an equivalent certification issued by another state."

**Is there a guarantee of the budget for a portion or all of this work?**

No. The funding will come out of our operating budget, and if there are significant cuts to the budget there is a chance that we do not proceed with a portion or all of the work.

**The RFP language is unclear to me regarding the level of audit required. Does City of Seattle require investment grade level audits for entire facilities, certain components, or not at all?**

The level of auditing needs to be enough to feel confident about whether a 20% energy savings is feasible and if so how. I write that it is a combination of a feasibility study, investment grade audit, and energy modeling because components of all three types could fall into this work.

**If investment grade audits are not required, will complete lighting inventories (i.e., counts, fixture types, etc.) be required?**

We want the consultant to capture and understand the systems in the building sufficiently to be able to determine whether the savings target is possible, and if so to be able to recommend how to achieve the target.

**Have energy audits been performed previously for the five buildings in scope?**

Yes, the Justice Center, Airport Way Center building A, and Haller Lake Facility building A were audited within the last four years. The difference between this scope and the previous audits is the analysis re: the specific target savings that needs to be achieved and the strategy/measures that need to be implemented to achieve them.

**Has the city completed facility conditions assessment reports for the facilities?**

Based on available information, there may have been a facility conditions assessment of Fire Station 25. Apparently the assessment focused on the boiler system (result was negative) but noted other visible items that were suspect (e.g. pipe lagging, tank insulation and pipe fittings). It does not appear that the other buildings underwent facility conditions assessments.

**Are appendices allowed beyond the 35-page limit?**

The mandatory proposal response (Section 8, bullet 7) has a page limit of 35. If the appendices are just as reference to information you are providing in the mandatory response, it is fine to include appendices. Please keep the appendices to a minimum. Evaluation of submittals will focus on the mandatory response, assuming the minimum qualifications are met.

**Is the Consultant Contracting RFP for facility energy assessment/analysis services only, or is it intended to also cover detailed engineering design and specification packages suitable to permit, bid, and construct the recommended measures?**

The on-call contract will be for energy assessment/analysis services only.

**What is the level of detail and accuracy required for Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) cost estimates under this RFP?**

Because we are evaluating whether a 20% energy savings is feasible, the energy savings analysis needs to be as accurate as possible. As for the ROMs, ideally they would be accurate, but we understand accuracy can be difficult without conducting comprehensive design work. ROMs will be challenging; if too conservative, decisions from the start may be to not implement, and conversely, if inaccurate, measures under construction may need to be value engineered or eliminated altogether.

**The RFP references “Investment Grade Audit” what defines Investment Grade for the RFP? Does Investment Grade apply to project costs estimates? Does Investment Grade apply to annual energy savings estimates?**

It refers to the level of detail and thoroughness that may be needed, in combination with modeling, to confidently determine whether 20% energy savings is feasible. The use of that term for the energy assessment/analysis services was not targeted to a specific item in the scope, such as just the measure cost estimates or annual energy savings estimates.

**Are there any ramifications or penalties for the consultant if actual project costs turn out to be greater than ROM estimates? Are there any ramifications for the consultant if actual and verified annual energy savings are less than estimated or the 20% target?**

No. However, I would assume it is in the consultant’s best interest to provide as accurate information (ROMs) as possible, perform well, and demonstrate reliability to clients.

**The RFP references developing a “measurement and verification plan, explaining how each measures is to be measured and verified (stipulated by agreement, utility bill analysis, end-use measurement and calculation, etc.)”. There is also language to “ensure” energy savings. Does this mean there is intention that the selected consulting firm would guarantee their energy savings estimates?**

No, we are not looking for guaranteed energy savings similar to ESPCs. The goal is to determine whether the target savings is feasible and if so how it can be achieved. The measurement and verification (M&V), metering/logging, energy modeling, etc. will demonstrate to the City the level of analysis and thought the consultant has put into determining the feasibility of the target. In the case of the M&V, a full-blown plan is not anticipated, but rather a sufficient amount of information to outline how the savings should/can be measured and caveats re: potential impacts to the savings (e.g., operating the system with different parameters) for each measure.

**What level of design work will be completed as a part of the building assessments and the subsequent proposed scope of energy improvements and/or upgrades?**

The scope is purely building energy assessment/analysis focused. The level of design, if any, will need to be determined by the consultant to confidently identify accurate measures and cost estimates that achieve the target savings. At this point, there is no plan to implement any proposed measures that may come out of this analysis.

**Does this RFP authorize Energy Performance Contracting services?**

This RFP is not specifically looking for ESPC services. However, this does/should not preclude an Energy Service Company from submitting a proposal to provide the on-call services.

**Is the RFP specifically for FAS operated facilities, or is it City-wide?**

Yes, just FAS owned and managed facilities, and specifically at this point on the buildings listed in Table 3 in Section 5.

**In the "Minimum Qualifications", you state a minimum of two (2) references each from owners and contractors/consultants ... for a minimum of four (4) references. Does this mean two references from owners and another two references from contractors/consultants? Also, the *Response Format* states that all Minimum Qualifications shall be provided in a "single page". Can you confirm that you need all reference info along with all other minimum qualifications within this one-page limit?**

Yes, a minimum of two references from the owner and another two references from the contractor/consultant. But this assumes you choose to team up with another company to do the work. So if it's just your company, than it's a minimum of two references. I would prefer more references though. And yes, one single page for addressing minimum qualifications; you can expand on information in the minimum qualification response in the Mandatory – Proposal Response (Section 8, bullet 7).

***Questions via Phone***

**Does one meet the minimum requirement regarding location if the company is headquartered in another State but as a local office that is used periodically?**

Technically that would meet the minimum qualification. Because this will be an on-call contract, our preference is that the staff working on the project work locally, in case there is a need for quick access to the staff and reducing the costs and footprint associated with traveling into Seattle to perform the on-call services.