



**IMPORTANT NOTICE
FOR
Requests for Grant Proposals #AEA-05-003 for
Planning and Implementation of Rural Energy End Use Efficiency Upgrades
RFP ISSUE DATE: September 15, 2004**

If you are taking this Request for Proposals (RFP) from the Web site and are intending on responding to it you **MUST** fill out the following information and reply to us via email or fax. If you do not send back this information, we will not know to send you any Amendments or clarifications to this RFP and any offer you submit may be rejected.

Please provide the following information by FAX or e-mail to the contact below:

Company name _____
Contact name _____
Company Address _____
Telephone number _____
Fax number _____
E-mail address _____

To obtain a CD copy of the USKH Phase I report referenced in this RFP interested Proposers who have downloaded this RFP document must contact Rebecca Garrett at the address below. The CD may be picked up in person or a copy may be mailed upon request.

Return to:

Contact: Rebecca Garrett
E-mail: rgarrett@aidea.org
The Alaska Energy Authority
813 West Northern Lights Blvd.
Anchorage, AK 99503
FAX: (907) 269-3044
Phone: (907) 269-4624

***Requests for Grant Proposals #AEA-05-003 for
Planning and Implementation of Rural Energy End Use Efficiency Upgrades***

Contact: Rebecca Garrett
E-mail: rgarrett@aidea.org
the Alaska Energy Authority
813 West Northern Lights Blvd.
Anchorage, AK 99503
FAX: (907) 269-3044
Phone: (907) 269-4624

RFP ISSUE DATE: September 15, 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONS	5
1.1 PURPOSE OF THIS REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)	5
1.2 AUTHORITY.....	5
1.3 ISSUING OFFICE.....	5
1.4 MAILING ADDRESS AND DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS	5
1.5 QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RFP	6
1.7 FUNDING OF THE GRANT.....	6
1.8 PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE	7
1.9 SOLICITATION AND ADVERTISING	7
2.0 STANDARD PROPOSAL INFORMATION	7
2.1 REQUIRED REVIEW	7
2.2 ADDENDA TO THE RFP	7
2.3 INCURRED COSTS.....	8
2.4 AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE	8
2.5 PROPOSER'S CERTIFICATION.....	8
2.6 CONFLICT OF INTEREST	8
2.7 DISCLOSURE OF PROPOSAL CONTENTS	8
2.8 SUBCONTRACTORS AND LOCAL LABOR	9
2.9 JOINT VENTURES.....	9
2.10 LICENSES.....	9
2.11 MULTIPLE OR ALTERNATE PROPOSALS.....	9
2.12 CORRECTION, MODIFICATION OR WITHDRAWAL OF PROPOSALS.....	9
2.13 RIGHT OF REJECTION.....	10
2.14 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS.....	10
2.16 INTERVIEWS FOR CLARIFICATION	10
2.17 DISCUSSIONS FOR BEST AND FINAL OFFERS.....	10
2.18 NEGOTIATIONS	11
2.19 FAILURE TO NEGOTIATE.....	11
2.20 NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD	11
2.21 PROTEST OF AWARD	11
2.22 PAYMENT OF TAXES.....	12
3.0 STANDARD GRANT INFORMATION	13
3.1 GRANT APPROVAL AND GRANT AGREEMENT.....	13
3.2 PROPOSAL AS PART OF THE GRANT	13
3.3 ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.....	13
3.4 INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS.....	13
3.5 STANDARD GRANT PROVISIONS.....	13
3.6 GRANT TYPE RESULTING FROM THE RFP	13
3.7 GRANT FUNDING REQUIREMENTS.....	14
3.8 PAYMENT PROCEDURES.....	14
3.9 GRANT PERSONNEL.....	14
3.10 REIMBURSEMENT TO THE AUTHORITY FOR UNACCEPTABLE DELIVERABLES.....	14
3.11 TERMINATION FOR DEFAULT	15
3.12 GRANT CHANGES	15
4.0 BACKGROUND	16
4.1 BACKGROUND.....	16
5.0 SCOPE OF WORK	17

5.1	PROJECT GOAL.....	17
5.2	TASK I COORDINATION AND PLANNING	17
5.3	TASK II IMPLEMENTATION.....	17
5.4	TASKS III REPORTING	18
5.5	OTHER TERMS OR CONDITIONS	18
6.0	PROPOSAL FORMAT AND CONTENT.....	19
6.1	LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	19
6.2	PROJECT METHODOLOGY	19
6.3	ORGANIZATION AND PERSONAL QUALIFICATIONS & EXPERIENCE	20
6.5	COST.....	20
7.0	EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS	22
7.1	MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.....	22
7.2	EVALUATION COMMITTEE.....	22
7.3	EVALUATION GUIDELINES.....	22
7.4	EVALUATION CRITERIA	22
7.4.1	<i>10 points Understanding the Problem.....</i>	<i>22</i>
7.4.2	<i>35 points Methodology.....</i>	<i>23</i>
7.4.3	<i>35 points Qualifications and Experience of Firm and Personnel.....</i>	<i>23</i>
7.4.4	<i>20 points Cost.....</i>	<i>23</i>
7.5	EVALUATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION OPTIONS.....	24
7.6	REVIEW OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS	24
7.7	RECOMMENDATION TO THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.....	24
	ATTACHMENTS	24
	APPENDIX A STANDARD GRANT AGREEMENT	
	APPENDIX B DENALI COMMISSION GRANT – TERMS AND CONDITIONS	

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONS

1.1 Purpose of this Request for Proposals (RFP)

With initial funding from the Denali Commission, the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) is soliciting grant proposals for end use efficiency (conservation) measures in seventeen (17) rural communities based on energy audit recommendations prepared by USKH in October 2003 under contract to Alaska Energy Authority (AEA). A copy of that audit is available on CD upon request to the Project Manager.

Grantee work under this proposal will include communications and coordination with local organizations; preparation for AEA approval of a plan for implementation of USKH recommendations (including basis for recommendations and prioritization of planned upgrades); purchase and installation of wiring, fixtures, thermostats, motors, pumps, and necessary electrical and control system modifications to complete the upgrade of the lighting systems and mechanical systems; and reporting on the work to AEA as it is completed.

1.2 Authority

This project is being completed in accordance with AS 44.83.080 (8) which gives the authority to accept gifts, grants, or loans from, and enter into contracts or other transactions regarding them, with any person, and Denali Commission project number 0048-DC-2002-11.

1.3 Issuing Office

Mailing Address:

Alaska Energy Authority
813 West Northern Lights Blvd
Anchorage, AK 99503

Physical Address:

Alaska Energy Authority
813 West Northern Lights Blvd
Anchorage, AK 99503

Contact: Christopher Rutz

Telephone: (907) 269-3015

The issuing office for this solicitation is the Alaska Energy Authority. One (1) free RFP, with associated grant documents may be picked up or requested from the above listed location during the regular working hours of 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon and 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday excluding Authority holidays. The Authority assumes no liability for incorrect addresses or delivery of RFP packages or supplemental information by public or private carriers.

1.4 Mailing Address and Deadline for Receipt of Proposals

Proposers must submit three (3) copies of their proposal to the issuing office located at 813 W. Northern Lights Blvd, Anchorage AK 99503 in a sealed envelope(s) clearly labeled:

AEA-05-003 Grant Proposals for Planning and Implementation of End Use Efficiency

Proposals must be received by the issuing office no later than 5:00 p.m. October 15, 2004. Failure to meet the deadline will result in disqualification of the proposal without review.

1.5 Questions about the RFP

Any technical or procedural questions regarding the RFP or contractual documents should be directed to the Procurement Manager, Chris Rutz at the address above. All questions that require clarification or interpretation of this RFP that cannot be answered by careful review of the document should be received in writing at the issuing office address no later than October 5, 2004. The Procurement manager will respond in writing if the question cannot be answered by directing the proposer to the appropriate section of the RFP. Copies of any written response to questions will be made available to all parties that receive the RFP.

1.6 Roles of Government Organizations for this Solicitation

Denali Commission

The Denali Commission's goals include to providing job training and other economic development services in rural communities particularly distressed communities and promoting rural development and providing power generation and transmission facilities, modern communication systems, water and sewer systems and other infrastructure improvements. The mandate of the Denali Commission is to deliver services in the most cost-effective manner practicable by reducing administrative and overhead costs.

The Denali Commission receives and distributes federal funding on a yearly basis. The commission meets and determines how to spend that money within their guidelines. Recently, they asked AEA to complete a publication called the *Alaska Rural Energy Plan*. The results of this publication have provided additional ideas for effective projects to the commission. One of these projects is End Use Efficiency.

The Alaska Energy Authority

The Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) is a public corporation of the State of Alaska with the purpose to promote, develop, and advance the general prosperity and economic welfare of the people of the state by providing a means of financing and operating power projects and by carrying out the powers and duties assigned to it under AS 42.45. AEA has applied for and received funding to implement a portion of the *Alaska Rural Energy Plan* involving upgrades to public facilities that would result in a reduction of power consumption.

Local Community Organizations

The work being completed under this grant is being completed on behalf of local community organizations. Local community organizations may include: village councils, local governments, school districts, or other public entities that own or are responsible for the facility. Their role is to assist the grantee in selecting which buildings would be the highest priority in their community, offer matching resources to this project in cash or in-kind contributions, and provide authorization to the grantee for the work to be completed.

1.7 Funding of the Grant

A grant resulting from this RFP is subject to the availability of appropriations for the purpose of the grant. AEA currently has \$650,000 available for this project from the Denali Commission. Initial Awards are expected to be based on following amounts by regions as identified below. Regions are defined by ANCSA borders and grouped as: Northwestern – NANA and Bering Straits, Western – Calista, and Southwest – Aleut, Bristol Bay, and Koniag,

Western	(8 communities)	\$305,882
---------	-----------------	-----------

Northwest 1 (5 communities)	\$191,176
Northwest 2 (2 communities)	\$76,470
Southwest (2 communities)	\$76,470

The grants may be awarded for multiple years; future years' funding is subject to availability of funding for communities within the regions noted. Additional communities may also be added within these regions in future years based on available funding.

1.8 Period of Performance

Below is a tentative schedule of critical dates as it relates to this project and subsequent grant award. Changes may occur as required.

Proposal Due Date	October 15, 2004
Proposal Review	2-3 weeks
Notification of Successful Proposer(s)	Upon completion of proposal review
Grant Negotiations & Approvals	1-2 week
Project Start Date	approximately 12/1/2004
Completion Date	1 year

Additional work may be requested by AEA upon availability of additional grant funds and the grant agreements may be renewed for up to 4 additional one year periods.

1.9 Solicitation and Advertising

This solicitation for proposals is being published on the State of Alaska on-line Public Notice web site at <http://state.ak.us> under **Public Notices, Legal, Bids**.

2.0 STANDARD PROPOSAL INFORMATION

2.1 Required Review

Proposers shall carefully review this solicitation without delay, for defects and questionable or objectionable matter. Questions, objections or comments should be made in writing and received by the Procurement Manager, Chris Rutz at the issuing office, no later than October 5, 2004 . This allows the Authority time to make any necessary amendments before the deadline for proposals. Protests regarding the RFP terms or conditions, or scope and nature of the program will be denied if received after the closing date for receipt of proposals.

2.2 Addenda to the RFP

Addenda to this request for proposals may be issued at the Authority's option. Any interested proposer, however, may request modifications to the scope, specifications, or administrative requirements. Any such request should be made in writing and received by the Procurement Manager, Chris Rutz at the issuing office, no later than October 5, 2004 .Final acceptance or denial of the request is the decision of the Procurement Manager. Failure of the Procurement Manager to respond in writing to a request for addenda to the RFP shall be considered a

rejection of the request. All addenda will be in writing and issued to all persons who receive copies of this RFP.

2.3 Incurred Costs

No costs incurred by Proposers in preparation of proposal(s), including travel and personal expenses, may be charged as an expense of performing the grant. The Authority shall not pay for any costs incurred by the proposer for proposal preparation or subsequent grant preparation as a result of termination of this RFP or termination of the grant resulting from this award of the RFP.

2.4 Authorized Signature

Proposals must be signed by an individual authorized to bind the Proposer to its provisions. The proposal must remain valid for at least ninety (90) days from the proposal receipt deadline.

2.5 Proposer's Certification

By signature on their proposal, Proposers certify that they are complying and will comply with: 1) the laws of the Authority of Alaska; 2) the applicable portion of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964; 3) the Equal Employment Opportunity Act, the Americans With Disability Act (ADA) and the regulations issued thereunder by the federal government; and 4) all terms and conditions set out in this RFP. If any proposer fails to comply with 1) through 4) of this paragraph, the Authority reserves the right to disregard the proposal, terminate the grant, or consider the grantee in default.

2.6 Conflict of Interest

Each proposal shall include a statement indicating whether or not the firm or any individuals working on the grant has a possible conflict of interest. If there is a conflict of interest or appearance of such a conflict, a brief description of the nature of the conflict must be included in the statement. If, in the opinion of the evaluation committee, there is a significant conflict of interest in the Proposer's proposal the evaluation committee may reject the proposal or require the proposer to take actions to eliminate the conflict prior to award of the grant.

2.7 Disclosure of Proposal Contents

Proposals will be opened and evaluated in such a way as to avoid disclosure of contents to competing Proposers during the evaluation process and as necessary prior to negotiations. To the extent that the proposer designates and the grant administrator concurs, proprietary data contained in proposals may be considered confidential. Any material requested to be confidential must be clearly noted in the proposal and include a brief statement as to the need for confidentiality.

The Authority will make public the evaluation summary at the time the evaluation committee makes its recommendations to the Procurement Manager.

All proposals (but not the above referenced evaluation summary) will be kept confidential until after the Procurement Manager makes a final decision to approve or reject the recommendation of the evaluation committee.

Grant files will include a copy of each proposal submitted and be open to reasonable inspection by the public once the Procurement Manager has made a final decision. All proposals and material submitted become the property of the Authority and may be returned only at the Authority's option. All proposals submitted will be kept on file by the AEA for a minimum of two years.

2.8 Subcontractors and Local Labor

Proposers may contract portions of the project tasks; however, the successful grantee will be required to comply with reasonable contracting guidelines during the performance of this grant. All Proposers are required to submit the names and addresses of known proposed subcontractors and the type and percentage of work they will be providing on this project. If the subcontractors are not known at the time of submitting their proposal the proposer should discuss how it intends to obtain qualified labor resources for completing the work and what, if any level of local community labor it intends to use.

If the successful grantee proposes to accomplish more than 50% of the work through subcontracts, it must provide a written statement that it is not operating as a joint venture with the other organizations or contractors and will be solely responsible for all work products, profits, and losses, as they relate to the performance of this grant.

2.9 Joint Ventures

Joint ventures will be acceptable for the performance of this grant.

2.10 Licenses

All Proposers and any subcontractors are required to have all applicable business, contract, and professional licenses prior to beginning work as it relates to this project.

2.11 Multiple or Alternate Proposals

Multiple or alternate proposals may be considered if it is in the best interest of the Authority to do so.

2.12 Correction, Modification or Withdrawal of Proposals

A proposal may be corrected, modified or withdrawn by providing a written request from an authorized agent of the proposer to the grant manager before the time and date set for receipt of the proposals. After proposals are opened modifications may be allowed prior to completion of the evaluation process if the evaluation committee determines that it is in the best interest of the Authority to solicit modifications or best and final proposals.

The apparent successful proposer may be requested to modify or correct his proposal during negotiations to the extent it is in the best interests of the Authority.

2.13 Right of Rejection

Proposers must comply with all of the terms of the RFP, and with all applicable local, state, and federal laws, codes, and regulations.

The Procurement Manager, based on recommendations of the evaluation committee, may reject any proposals that do not comply with all of the material and substantial terms, conditions, and performance requirements of the RFP.

The Procurement Manager may waive minor formalities that do not affect responsiveness; that are merely a matter of form or format; that do not change the relative standing or otherwise prejudice other offers; that do not change the meaning or scope of the RFP; that are trivial, negligible, or immaterial in nature; that do not reflect a material change in the scope of work; or, that do not constitute a substantial reservation against a requirement or provision.

The Authority reserves the right to reject any or all proposals if it is determined that award would not be in the best interest of the Authority or the Denali Commission determines not to fund the project for any reason.

2.14 Evaluation of Proposals

All proposals received will be reviewed and evaluated by a committee that will be made up of Authority employees or others as may be appropriate. The evaluation will be based on the evaluation factors set out in Section 7.0 of this RFP.

2.16 Interviews for Clarification

The Evaluation Committee (EC) may interview Proposers to provide clarification of certain points in proposals prior to completion of the evaluation process. The purpose would be to give the EC a more complete understanding of the responsiveness of the proposal. Material changes to proposals will not be allowed during the request for clarifications. However, additional information may be requested for the purposes of clarification, and all Proposers will be given similar opportunities for clarification. Interviews will be conducted in such a manner that information derived from competing Proposers is not disclosed. Interviews will be scheduled at the convenience of the issuing office. AS 44.62.310 does not apply to meetings with Proposers conducted under this section. Interviews may be conducted by teleconference.

2.17 Discussions for Best and Final Offers

The Evaluation Committee (EC) may require written or oral submittals from Proposers for the purpose of clarification. The purpose of these submittals will be to ensure full understanding of the requirements of the RFP in order for the EC to more clearly determine the best proposal when two or more responses are similarly scored after the preliminary evaluation. Discussions will be limited to sections of the RFP identified by the EC. Discussions will be with only the most qualified Proposers who have submitted a proposal deemed reasonably susceptible for award by the EC.

Discussions, if held, will be after the preliminary evaluation of proposals has been completed by the EC. If modifications are made as a result of these discussions they will be put in writing. Following discussions, the EC may set a time for best and final proposal submissions from those Proposers with whom discussions were held. Re-evaluation of the best and final proposals will be limited to the specific sections of the RFP opened to discussion by the Procurement Manager.

2.18 Negotiations

There may be some items that will need to be negotiated prior to execution of a grant agreement. It is anticipated that negotiations will be held at the Alaska Energy Authority located at 813 W. Northern Lights Blvd, Anchorage, Alaska, or by teleconference.

2.19 Failure to Negotiate

If a selected proposer fails to provide the necessary information for negotiations in a timely manner, negotiate in good faith, or meet the Authority's minimum terms and conditions, the Authority may terminate negotiations and negotiate with the next highest ranked proposer, or terminate the award of the grant.

2.20 Notice of Intent to Award

After completion of the evaluation process and review by the procurement manager the issuing office will issue a Notice of Intent to Award to all Proposers. This notice will contain the names and addresses of all the Proposers including the intended recipient(s) of the grant(s).

2.21 Protest of Award

If a proposer is denied a grant award and believes that there was an error or impropriety in the evaluation process the proposer may appeal the decision to the Executive Director for the Authority. The protest must be filed within ten days after the proposer receives notice that it was not selected for award and must include the following minimum information:

- A. The name, address, and telephone number of the protester;
- B. The signature of the protester or the protester's representative;
- C. Identification of the granting agency and the grant program at issue;
- D. A detailed statement of the legal and factual grounds of the protest, including copies of relevant documents, and;
- E. A statement of the relief requested.

Protests filed by telex or telegram are not acceptable because they do not contain a signature. Fax copies of the protest containing a signature are acceptable. Protests received after the 10 day period will be rejected as untimely. The award of grants may proceed prior to the resolution of the protest.

Upon receipt of the protest the Executive Director may make a final decision upon review of the protest and grant process, delegate review of the protest to the Procurement Manager or some other individual to make a recommendation, or appoint or act as a hearing officer and conduct an informal hearing.

The decision of the Executive Director will be final.

In the event the protest is upheld and grant award has been made, damages, if documented, would be limited to grant preparation costs; payment would be subject to availability of funds.

2.22 Payment of Taxes

If it is discovered that the potential grantee is in arrears on taxes, the grant shall not be awarded until the Alaska Energy Authority approves of the payment provisions of the grant.

3.0 STANDARD GRANT INFORMATION

3.1 Grant Approval and Grant Agreement

This RFP does not obligate the Authority to expend any funds for the proposed grant until a grant agreement is signed and approved by both parties. If a grant agreement is approved, it is effective from the starting date in the approved grant. The Authority shall not be responsible for any costs incurred prior to approval of the grant by the Executive Director of AEA, or his designee.

3.2 Proposal as Part of the Grant

“The successful proposal will become a part of the grant except to the extent the grant agreement specifies otherwise.”

3.3 Additional Terms and Conditions

The Authority reserves the right to incorporate additional terms and conditions into the grant agreement prior to award of the grant. The purpose of these terms would be to clarify any questions that may arise with respect to the scope of this RFP or proposals submitted..

3.4 Insurance Requirements

The successful Proposer will be required to maintain adequate insurance coverage as determined by the Division of Risk Management. Subcontractors may also be required to comply with the same minimum insurance requirements. Insurance requirements are specified in the grant agreement (See Attachment A).

3.5 Standard Grant Provisions

The Grantee will be expected to comply with the terms and conditions of the AEA Standard Grant Agreement form. A copy of that document is included in **Attachment A** for your reference as well as any federal terms and conditions that may be passed through based on the funding source requirements.

3.6 Grant Type Resulting from the RFP

This RFP solicits proposals for grants of funds to carry out a public purpose of improving the efficiency of end-use of energy in rural Alaska. It is not a procurement of services or property for the direct benefit of the State of Alaska. The RFP process and the evaluation of proposals are exempt from the Alaska Procurement Code under AS 36.30.850(b)(1).

The grant awarded as a result of this RFP will be a fixed price cost reimbursable grant with options to add additional funds based on successful performance by the grantee and availability of additional funding for their region(s). The initial period of performance will be for one year with options to extend the grants to perform additional work for 4 additional one year periods.

The Authority intends to reimburse the grantee in phases based on satisfactory completion of tasks identified in a negotiated payment schedule subject to successful performance in accordance with the terms and conditions of the grant.

3.7 Grant Funding Requirements

\$650,000 is currently available to spend on the project. This initial funding will be made available in the following amounts for the regions identified below:

Western Region	\$ 305,882
Northwest 1	\$ 191,176
Northwest 2	\$ 76,470
Southwest	\$ 76,470

As additional funding becomes available the grants may be amended to add additional work identified in the scope of the USKH report or discovered during the implementation phase of the projects in the regions outlined in this solicitation. Grantees who are able to provide additional funding for completing projects, or are able to seek out matching funds will be rated higher in the evaluation process.

3.8 Payment Procedures

The Authority will pay only as work on the grant progresses.

The Authority intends to pay the grantee a negotiated sum based upon satisfactory completion of tasks, review of the required deliverables, and submission of a request for payment by the grantee.

No payment shall be made until the request for payment has been approved and authorized by the grant manager.

3.9 Grant Personnel

The Authority reserves the right to approve or disapprove any change in the successful Proposer's project team members whose participation in the project is specifically offered in the proposal or the grant agreement. Similarly, changes in the amount of participation by key project members will require Authority approval. This is to ensure that persons with vital experience and skill remain fully involved in the project.

Requests for any change in grantee personnel shall be submitted in writing to the Authority for the Authority's review and approval before the change is made. Grantee personnel changes, not approved by the Authority, may be cause for the Authority to terminate the grant agreement.

3.10 Reimbursement to the Authority for Unacceptable Deliverables

The grantee is responsible for quality, occurrence and completion of all work identified by the grant. All work shall be subject to evaluation and inspection by the Authority at all times to assure satisfactory progress, to be certain that work is being performed in accordance with the

grant specifications, terms and conditions, and to determine if corrections and modifications are necessary. Should such inspections indicate substantial failure on the part of the grantee, the Authority may terminate the grant for default. Furthermore, the Authority may require the grantee to reimburse any monies paid (pro rata based on the identified proportion of unacceptable products received) and any associated damage costs.

3.11 Termination for Default

If the grantee refuses or fails to perform in accordance with the terms of the grant, with such diligence as will ensure its completion within the agreed upon time frame, the Authority may, by written notice to the grantee, terminate the grant or those parts of the work to which there have been delays.

3.12 Grant Changes

During the course of performing the work required by this grant, the grantee may be requested to perform additional work within the general scope of the grant. Such direction shall come from the grant manager in writing.

When additional work or modifications to the grant agreement is required, the Executive Director of the Alaska Energy Authority through the grant manager shall forward to the grantee a description of the work to be accomplished and request that a proposal be offered within a given time period. The Executive Director of the Alaska Energy Authority through the grant manager shall then act upon the proposal submitted by the grantee, either granting or denying in writing permission to proceed with the described work.

Under no circumstances shall additional work proceed by the grantee beyond the time frame or not to exceed amounts specified in the grant without an approved written grant amendment by the grant administrator.

4.0 BACKGROUND

4.1 Background

The Alaska Energy Authority's mission is to assist in the development of safe, reliable, and efficient energy systems throughout Alaska, which are financially viable and environmentally sound.

In June 2004, AEA released the final *Alaska Rural Energy Plan* which is being used as a planning document for rural energy programs throughout the state. This document can be found on the AEA website at <http://www.aidea.org/aea.htm>. The intent of the plan is to aggregate the energy needs in the rural areas of the state, provide analysis of where energy projects should go in the future, establish priorities for energy project development, and efficiency measures.

Supported by state and federal funding, AEA's end use efficiency (energy conservation) program is directed at identifying and implementing cost-saving efficiency measures in schools and other community facilities. These goals complement Alaska Housing Finance Corporation's programs aimed at residential efficiency. In August 2003 USKH was hired to do an engineering analysis of the 17 proposed communities. Their full report is available on CD-Rom and will be made available to Proposers upon request from the contact person on the first page of this RFP. The purpose of this grant is to find an organization that can move forward in implementing these efficiency measures in community buildings in these locations.

5.0 SCOPE OF WORK

The grantees under this project will have three primary areas of responsibility: coordination and project planning with local communities, implementation to include contracting and installation of upgrades, and reporting to AEA.

5.1 Project Goal

The goal of this RFP is to provide grants to entities that can implement energy efficiency measures plans in 17 rural Alaska Communities based on the September 2003 assessment completed by USKH.

Measures include furnishing and installation of all wiring, fixtures, thermostats, motors, pumps, and necessary electrical and control system modifications to complete the upgrade of the lighting system and mechanical systems at various buildings in 17 rural communities.

5.2 Task I Coordination and Planning

The grantee will be required to perform all planning and coordination necessary to assure the projects are successfully completed. At a minimum this task is will include;

- Review the work prepared by USKH. Review AEA's proposed list of work and provide current price estimates for work that is proposed to be completed.
- Meet with community leaders. For example, develop and review work plans and scheduling with local contacts, obtain written approval and waivers as required for working in the communities buildings, discuss options for using local labor, develop priority lists and explore ways to optimize use of available funds. Some contact names will be provided by the Program Manager, while additional contacts within communities will be made by the grantee.
- Prepare and submit a detailed plan to AEA for upgrading and repairing community buildings. Plans will include ranking buildings proposed for upgrading in a priority order, preparing detailed cost estimates, specifying how grant funds will be spent and other sources of funding, compiling community contact names, and discussing issues for that community.

5.3 Task II Implementation

The grantee will be required to coordinate completing the work with each community. Implementation may be through the grantee conducting the work on behalf of the community or through the community doing the work under the oversight of the grantee. Work will include:

- Making any necessary agreements and obtaining approvals and waivers as required to gain access to facilities and complete the work in the community.
- Purchasing supplies and materials
- Providing or contracting with qualified individuals to complete the work.
- Supervising the work to make sure it is properly completed and funds are spent as proposed and as required by the grant agreement.
- Resolving any issues, claims or disputes with the community, contractors or suppliers regarding the work.

- Following up on warranty work or providing a means for the community to follow up with manufacturers or suppliers as appropriate.

5.4 Tasks III Reporting

At a minimum the grantee will be required to keep the Authority informed of the status of projects as they are completed and provide final reports. This task is expected to include:

- Providing a monthly report on the status of the project.
- Providing documentation that the work was completed as proposed
- Providing a final report in electronic and hardcopy format by region, community, and building name. The final report will include pictures of installed work.

5.5 Other Terms or Conditions

1. Site evaluations may be performed by AEA's project manager as needed.
2. The grantee must designate a project manager responsible for oversight of the project.
3. AEA reserves the right to remove deliverables based on the benefit/cost savings ratio.
4. Pictures of completed and installed upgrades will be required. Pictures must be in electronic format.
5. If Proposers prefer to request competitive bids for the construction phase they may so indicate in their proposals, however they must describe the competitive bidding process they intend to use in their proposal in responding to requirement 6.2.1 below.
6. Initial grants will also require compliance with Denali Commission pass-through terms and conditions included as Appendix B to this RFP.

6.0 PROPOSAL FORMAT AND CONTENT

All proposals must contain the following information and be presented in the format outlined in this section. Proposals should focus on the requested information. Failure to follow this format for a proposal or failure to include complete information as requested may result in a lower score or disqualification of the proposal depending on the extent of the discrepancy.

Communities are grouped into regions for the purpose of allowing for multiple grant awards and to provide for possible economies of scale in performing work within a specific region.

Proposals must address all communities within a region. Offers may provide proposals for more than one region, however each region will be awarded its own grant. Regions will be allocated funding in accordance with the schedule outlined below. Final allocation of resources will be subject to negotiations and approval of the Project Manager. The Authority reserves the right to adjust the funding levels between regions prior to award of any grants. For the purpose of responding to this solicitation Proposers should submit proposals for one or more of the following areas and allocations based on the funding for the region and the communities in that region noted below.

Western	Chefornak, Kongiginak, Kwigillingok, Chevak, Quinhagak, Mekoryuk, Nunapitchuk, and Kasigluk)
Northwest 1	Savoonga, Gambell, Elim, Koyuk, Golovin)
Northwest 2	Buckland, Selawik
Southwest	Port Heiden, Old Harbor

6.1 Letter of Transmittal

The letter of transmittal must contain the complete name and address of the organization submitting the proposal as well as the name, mailing address, telephone number and fax number of the contact person for the proposal. The letter must also include a statement confirming that the proposal will remain valid for at least ninety (90) days from the proposal receipt deadline. Proposers should provide an executive summary as to why their organization should be selected for this grant. The letter must be signed by an individual authorized to bind the proposer to the provisions of the proposal.

6.2 Project Methodology

This section should discuss your methods and resources you will use to accomplish the work proposed under this project. At a minimum it should include:

1. A brief discussion of your organization. Include who will be the project manager and any proposed subcontracts or suppliers, and/or how you intend to find and select the resources you will use to complete the work under this grant.
2. Identify your proposed coordination efforts with the communities including a description of the regions you intend to operate in and your means and methods for prioritizing the projects.

3. Explain how you propose to perform the work necessary to accomplish the project goals and the tasks described in section 5 of this RFP. Include a description of how you propose to use local labor where it may be available. If you feel the specific tasks described in section 5 should be modified to accomplish the project goals, whether by adding tasks, removing tasks, changing tasks, or otherwise, please explain.
4. Discuss any suggestions you may have on how to maximize the funding available, include any proposed cost share or matching fund opportunities.
5. Provide a work schedule with critical dates and proposed time frame for completing the tasks identified in your proposal.
6. Identify potential problems or requirements related to this project that you perceive may be encountered in performance of this project. Include administrative or legal concerns you may have with standard grant agreement language or specifications.
7. Provide any alternative suggestions that you believe could be helpful in meeting the objectives and goals of this RFP.

6.3 Organization and Personal Qualifications & Experience

The proposal must include at least the following information about personnel:

1. Identify the project manager and key staff to be assigned to each component of the project and describe their responsibilities. Provide information on their training and experience. Include the resumes of all project staff.
2. List the most significant projects that have been performed by the organization in the last two years for services similar to those outlined in the scope of work in this RFP. Include a minimum of three references, a description of services provided to the client, and the name and telephone number of the Project Manager.
3. If one or more subcontractors are to be used, include a description of responsibilities and the qualifications and experience of the staff and the firms.
4. Provide documentation about the Proposer's financial capability. This documentation may be either in the form of a financial statement, or letters from the bank or bonding company. Similar information may be requested for any proposed subcontractors as well.

6.5 Cost

Communities are broken up into regions for the purpose of allowing for multiple grant awards and to provide for possible economies of scale in performing work within a specific region.

Proposals must address all communities within a region. Proposals may address more than one region, however each region will be awarded its own grant. Regions will be allocated funding in accordance with the schedule outlined below. Final allocation of resources will be subject to

negotiations and approval of the Project Manager. The Authority reserves the right to adjust the funding levels between regions prior to award of any grants.

Western	\$ 305,882
Northwest 1	\$ 191,176
Northwest 2	\$ 76,470
Southwest	\$ 76,470

Proposers must include in their proposal how they would allocate costs for the tasks outlined in the scope of work as well as a fee schedule including proposed labor rates, direct expenses, overhead and profit.

7.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

7.1 Minimum Requirements

All proposals will be initially reviewed to see if they include the following minimum requirements:

- a. Proposers must show a clear understanding of the project and its goals.
- b. Proposers must demonstrate previous experience working in rural Alaska, working on similar projects, and provide references.

Proposals that do not demonstrate meeting these requirements will be rejected without further review.

7.2 Evaluation Committee

All proposals that meet the minimum requirements will be reviewed and evaluated (scored) by a committee on the basis of the evaluation criteria set forth in this section. The Evaluation Committee will consist of at least three representatives of the Authority

The Evaluation Committee may request outside assistance as needed during the evaluation process to review or provide recommendations of specific aspects of a proposal, such as review of financial plans or proposed building requirements.

7.3 Evaluation Guidelines

Each committee member shall exercise independent judgment and no member's vote or score will be weighted more than any other. A consensus method of scoring may also be used. Proposals will be opened and evaluated in a manner which avoids disclosure of the contents to competing Proposers during the evaluation process and negotiations.

Evaluators may discuss factual knowledge of, and may investigate Proposers' and proposed subcontractors' prior work experience and performance, including projects referenced in proposals, available written evaluations, listed references or other persons knowledgeable of a Proposer's and/or a subcontractor's past performance. Factors such as overall experience relative to the proposed contract, quality of work, control of cost, and ability to meet schedules may be addressed.

All decisions of the Evaluation Committee will be documented in writing and made a part of the grant file.

7.4 Evaluation Criteria

7.4.1 10 points Understanding the Problem

Proposers are required to show a clear understanding of the project and its goals. At a minimum this section may be evaluated against the following questions:

Does the proposer demonstrate understanding of the project? Does the proposer demonstrate understanding of how to maximize value to the communities? Has the proposer discussed any possible problems that may arise during performance of the project and provided solutions?

7.4.2 35 points Methodology

At a minimum this section may be evaluated against the following questions:

Does the Proposer's work plan include all objectives and tasks identified in the RFP? Has the proposer proposed a methodology that would provide the highest possible reduction in energy use while meeting the concerns of the communities? Does the proposed process include involvement with appropriate communities' contacts, contractors, and suppliers? Does the proposer provide for adequate support in terms of personnel and time? Are the persons with appropriate experience and qualifications working on this project on appropriately assigned tasks? Does the proposal identify personnel for the implementation phase, and do they have the necessary qualifications and experience? If not, does the proposer identify how it will acquire qualified personal for the implementation phase and minimum requirements or expectations for those individuals? To what degree are key personnel committed to the project? Is the approach proposed technically and economically sound? Is the project budget reasonable based on what is proposed to be accomplished? Are the expectations the proposer have for the Authority, the Project Manager, and the communities involved in this process reasonable? If the proposer is proposing an alternative work plan different than the tasks listed in Section 5, does it address all project objectives and are the proposed changes in tasks justified? To what extent does the proposer propose to use local labor?

7.4.3 35 points Qualifications and Experience of Firm and Personnel

Proposers must demonstrate previous experience working in rural Alaska, working on similar projects, and provide references. At a minimum qualifications and experience may be evaluated against the following questions:

Does the proposer have adequate demonstrated experience in managing similar projects? Are there appropriately qualified individuals and subcontractors in key positions? What level of similar experience has been documented? Does the project manager have the necessary qualifications and experience? Does the proposer have experience in developing and operating similar projects in rural Alaskan Communities? What is the Proposer's record for timeliness, being within budget, developing creative solutions to similar projects, success in previous projects? How does the Proposer's experience and qualifications compare with the others? Do the examples provided document the quality of expertise and experience needed to successfully complete the grant? Are the examples from previous projects complete and relevant? Are the references positive; if not, are there adequate explanations or extenuating circumstances that should be considered? Are the personnel who are proposed to work on this job the same persons who worked on similar jobs for the firm? Are resumes complete?

7.4.4 20 points Cost

At a minimum this section will be evaluated against the following questions:

Are the time commitments and pay rates for key personnel reasonable to accomplish the objectives of the project? Are projected costs well justified? What is the percentage of overhead costs for the project vs. the amount available for upgrades that are proposed? How

do proposals compare to each other? Has the proposer demonstrated any reasonable methods for reducing costs or providing funding from additional sources? Are there reasonable suggestions for minimizing costs?

7.5 Evaluation Committee Recommendation Options

The Evaluation Committee may recommend to the Executive Director a proposer or Proposers for negotiations based on the first review and evaluation of proposals. They may reject all proposals, or they may request additional information from Proposers or develop a list of proposals reasonably susceptible for award and request best and final offers in accordance with Section 2.17.

Re-evaluation of proposals after interviews or discussions will be conducted by the same Evaluation Committee using the same criteria and weights laid out in this section.

7.6 Review of the Evaluation Process

Upon completion of the evaluations, the AEA Procurement Manager will review the evaluation process to assure procedures were followed in accordance with this RFP. This process may include reviewing score sheets, proposals, discussions or any other materials presented to the Evaluation Committee. The Procurement Manager may recommend that proposals be reevaluated prior to the Evaluation Committee making a final recommendation to award if he has reason to suspect an error was committed during the evaluation process.

7.7 Recommendation to the Executive Director

Upon completion of the review by the Procurement Manager, the Evaluation Committee will provide a summary of the evaluation process with a recommendation to the Executive Director. The recommendation may be to proceed with negotiations and award to the highest ranked proposer(s), to request "best and final" proposals based on a modification of the requirements, or to recommend no award.

The Executive Director may approve or reject the evaluation committee's recommendation as proposed, or approve or reject the recommendations with additional terms or conditions.

Attachments

APPENDIX A Standard Grant Agreement

APPENDIX B Denali Commission Grant – Terms and Conditions