



**DANE COUNTY DEPT. OF
ADMINISTRATION, PUBLIC
WORKS DIVISION**

1919 Alliant Energy Center Way
Madison, Wisconsin 53713
Office: 608/266-4018 ♦ Fax: 608/267-1533
Public Works Engineering Division

ADDENDUM

March 9, 2022

ATTENTION ALL REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) HOLDERS

RFP NO. 322007 - ADDENDUM NO. 3

COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY & EMISSIONS ASSESSMENT

PROPOSALS DUE: TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 2022, 2:00 PM. DUE DATE AND TIME ARE NOT CHANGED BY THIS ADDENDUM.

This Addendum is issued to modify, explain or clarify the original Request for Proposal (RFP) and is hereby made a part of the RFP. Please attach this Addendum to the RFP.

PLEASE MAKE THE FOLLOWING CHANGES:

1. Section 00 24 16 - Scopes of Proposals

Page 5 - Item 1.B.:

Change “A full list of county facilities, by category is included in Attachment B.” to “A full list of county facilities, by category is included in Attachment A.”

Page 7 - Item 3.A.1.:

Delete Item 3.A.1, “Attachment A – Vendor Information”. Attachment A consists of Dane County Facilities Lists and is not required in proposal package.

PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING CONSULTANT SUBMITTED QUESTIONS:

Q1: Would winning this contract preclude the bidder from later bidding on construction projects associated with this assessment?

A1: No. This assessment project is independent of our construction projects.

Q2: Is this the first time the County has pursued an assessment like this?

A2: Dane County first pursued a facility assessment about 10 years ago. At that time the County did not have a consolidated system for tracking energy use in our facilities so much of the contract was consumed with basic data gathering. One of the outcomes of that first assessment was the County implementing Energy CAP to track our energy usage.

Q3: Please clarify what is required for 3.A.1

A3: Our apologies – that’s a typo in the RFP. There is no Attachment A – Vendor Information; the proposals should include 8 (eight) sections. Item 3.A.1 deleted with this addendum.

- Q4:** If a respondent chooses to include a supporting partner (i.e. Not a joint venture, but a proven, identified expert to deliver most accurately on niche assessment areas such as demand response, battery storage, and beneficial electrification), should the primary respondent include 3 references from each firm?
- A4:** Yes, please include references for all parties included on the team
- Q5:** What about Dane County’s past, related assessments would the County most like to see done differently this time around?
- A5:** We want actionable results. We want facility-specific recommendations (hence the investment grade audit request and list of prioritized projects) that we can integrate into our 2023 budget.
- Q6:** Will Dane County provide a fleet vehicle inventory and estimated VMT and/or fuel records for fleet vehicles associated with the selected properties?
- A6:** Yes, we can provide a fleet inventory and fuel consumption records by department. We do not have VMT data or vehicle-specific fuel records associated with specific properties.
- Q7:** Does Dane County track interval utility data for any of the properties in Energy CAP?
- A7:** No. We have limited access to interval utility data for a few properties and this data is not integrated into Energy CAP at this time.
- Q8:** The RFP mentioned that there are over 50 Dane County buildings. Would you like all buildings benchmarked or just the 41 properties listed within Attachment A.
- A8:** As delineated in the RFP, we are seeking bids for audits of Tier 1 and Tier 2 facilities. Other facilities are not included in the base bid. The benchmarking is limited to our facilities that are included on the three lists in the RFP.
- Q9:** Please confirm the audit level requested for Tier 2 facilities. Should that be to an ASRAE Level 1 audit? ASHRAE Level 2 audit?
- A9:** We are seeking walk through audits of Tier 2 facilities.
- Q10:** Please confirm if the use of a vetted building energy model is required for Tier 2 facility audits
- A10:** RFP states “For all identified resource savings opportunities, the Contractor will use a vetted building energy model to estimate project cost and associated resource savings, specifying resource and dollar savings as well as associated greenhouse gas emission reductions.” If a Tier 2 Facility walk through audit identifies a resource savings opportunity, we’ll want to see costs and savings from an energy model.
- Q11:** Please confirm the number of buildings, total area, and overall scope of the energy assessment for the Henry Vilas Zoo Exhibits.
- A11:** MGE did a walk through audit of the Henry Vilas Zoo in October 2020. That audit identified 5 facilities – the bear exhibit, the aviary, Glacier Grille, the penguins and the primate/big cat building as opportunities for savings but stopped short of recommending solutions. Those five buildings represent about 32,000 SF in total. We will provide the MGE audit to the contractor as part of this effort.
- Q12:** Please confirm the requirement to provide an Investment Grade Audit for Tier 1 facilities. Investment Grade Audits are typically provided to identify capital intensive projects. Facilities identified as Tier 1 include those built-in 2017, 2016, and 2011 which likely will not require immediate capital upgrades. Can the proposer provide an alternative energy & emissions assessment approach for the County’s consideration?
- A12:** The first phase of the project will be a review of energy data that confirms the list of facilities targeted for investment grade audits. Staff prioritized Tier 1 facilities based on energy data and other considerations, including our carbon neutrality goals. We recommend proposers use the Tier 1 and Tier 2 facility lists included in the RFP as a basis for their proposals.

Q13: For the facility audit portion, the RFP references a “vetted building energy model.” Is there a particular energy model or models the County desires a selected partner to use, or is the goal to have an industry accredited approach/model that is approved for use by the County?

A13: We do not have a preferred energy model. As part of this project the contractor will generate best practices for Dane County’s ongoing energy management efforts and that might include a recommendation about energy modeling software.

Q14: How does the County plan to use the final assessment deliverable? To clarify, is there a particular format the County desires, such as for future utilization in bid documents for implementation, etc.?

A14: We will use the first deliverable to prioritize projects for inclusion in the County’s future capital budgets. We need enough information to develop sound capital budget requests but we are not looking for final design documents.

Q15: Under the SOW in Section 2 for Benchmarking it is stated: “The Contractor will use existing Dane County data to benchmark energy and water usage as well as emissions against comparable buildings in comparable climates.” – is the County asking that the selected partner take the County’s utility/water data and perform their own benchmark (a new benchmark calculation to compare to your internal one) outside of Energy Star Portfolio Manager/Energy CAP? Or is the request that the selected partner use their existing benchmarking results/tool?

A15: Our request is that the Contractor review our existing data—using our Energy CAP and/or Portfolio Manager accounts and, based on that review, recommend any updates to the list of Tier 1 and Tier 2 facilities. Essentially we want to leverage the Contractor’s expertise as a second set of eyes on the energy data before we begin the audits.

Q16: Section 3.A.4.vii. reads “Integrating electric vehicle charging into facilities.” Is the County looking to power facilities through electric vehicles (V2B) or for more charging stations for electric vehicles? Or both?

A16: Our first priority is charging stations to support fleet electrification. The potential for two-way charging is not a current priority.

Q17: Does the County have any existing EV charging roadmaps or plans to guide future fleet electric vehicle charging needs? Or will that be developed as part of this project?

A17: We do not have an EV charging roadmap. Developing an EV charging roadmap is beyond the scope of this project. Here, where we are doing building energy audits, we want to capture any insights relative to potential fleet electrification that will be relevant as we build out our charging network. We included this point about electric vehicle charging based on lessons learned from the City of Madison where their rapid transition to EVs has prompted some charging challenges at some facilities.

If any additional information about this Addendum is needed, please contact Todd Draper at 608/267-0119, draper@countyofdane.com.

Sincerely,

Todd Draper

Project Manager

Enclosures:
N/A