



April 8, 2013
ADDENDUM NO. 1

Comprehensive Energy Consulting and Management Services

RFP NO. 2013-069

CLARIFICATION:

The following questions were asked from vendors regarding certain items or clarification as it relates to the proposal, see answers below:

1. **Question:** How many Program Managers are a part of U.S. Communities?

Answer: There are approximately 10 field Program Managers.

2. **Question:** Are federal agencies excluded from U.S. Communities?

Answer: U.S. Communities does not exclude federal agencies from using its contracts. It is up to the federal agencies to determine if these contracts meet their requirements. The supplier's commitment to this contract pertains to all states, local governments, special districts, school districts, higher education and non-profits.

3. **Question:** In the Administration Agreement do suppliers accept the insurance and indemnification as is.

Answer: Insurance and indemnification language can be found in Exhibit 1 of the solicitation and not in the Administration Agreement. If the supplier has any exceptions to this language, it should clearly state such exceptions in its response. Any exceptions will be taken into consideration when evaluating proposals. The City reserves the right to accept, negotiate or reject any exceptions.

4. **Question:** Did I interpret the statement in the RFP that this is the only contract? Will there be a subsequent contract that protects participating agencies? Will it be a fair statement that this is a Master Agreement and there will be a more specific contract between the agency and awarded vendor?

Answer: Participating Public Agencies consent to the Master Intergovernmental Cooperative Purchasing Agreement (MICPA), reference Exhibit 2 of the solicitation, which allows them to utilize this Master Agreement without having to enter into a separate agreement. It is up to the Supplier to ask the Participating Public Agency if there are additional terms or requirements and MICPA permits a Participating Public Agency and Supplier to agree upon certain different or alternative terms and conditions. Each Supplier has discretion as to whether such terms and conditions are acceptable.

5. **Question:** I am assuming that this is the lowest price offered through this contract not including federal agencies?
- Answer:** Supplier is required to offer the lowest overall pricing (net to purchaser) to public agencies. This includes states, local governments, school districts, higher education institutions and nonprofits.
6. **Question:** There is a disconnect between providing an across the board price and the fact that proposers will be expected to tailor to a specific agency.
- Answer:** Pricing is to be a menu of services for the Participating Public Agency to choose from.
7. **Question:** On page 16 of the RFP, if all of these qualifications are not met does this disqualify the vendor?
- Answer:** A “no” answer to these questions may disqualify you from consideration.
8. **Question:** How many energy consultants will be hired for this contract?
- Answer:** The City’s intent is to make a single award. The City reserves the right to make multiple awards if it decides it is in the best interest of the City and U.S. Communities to accommodate the diverse needs of Participating Public Agencies.
9. **Question:** Is the City definitely going to award work? There seems to be conflicting information in the RFP.
- Answer:** It is the City’s intent to award work. The City’s primary interest is in electricity consulting but may utilize other services outlined in the solicitation. Natural gas within the State of Texas is not deregulated at this time. The City currently participates in an interlocal agreement with Tarrant County for its gasoline and other fuel products.
10. **Question:** What entities from U.S. Communities will be using this contract?
- Answer:** All U.S. Communities contracts are non-exclusive and optional. It is up to each Participating Public Agency to determine if the contract meets its needs.
11. **Question:** What is the City of Mesquite’s interest in being the lead agency for this procurement?
- Answer:** The City currently participates as a user of a number of contracts with a variety of cooperative purchasing agencies and other local governments. We thought it would be beneficial to be the lead agency for a consulting contract that is a major benefit to the City in procuring its energy needs.
12. **Question:** Do you have any specific requirements regarding this contract?

- Answer:** Reference Proposal Information, paragraph 2, Minimum Qualifications, for the minimum requirements of this contract.
13. **Question:** What is the current City of Mesquite usage for energy consulting?
- Answer:** For the period September 2011 to August 2012 the City's electricity consumption was 25,282,196 kWh.
14. **Question:** On page 8 of the RFP, it mentions \$50 million will be purchased. Is that right?
- Answer:** This volume is an estimate of the value of the contract, not a guarantee.
15. **Question:** What are the years that \$50 million will be reached?
- Answer:** U.S. Communities anticipates the awarded Supplier(s) to be at this volume threshold annually by the end of the term of this contract. It is up to the Supplier(s) to sell its services to Participating Public Agencies.
16. **Question:** The term of this contract could possibly be 5 years, correct?
- Answer:** The contract term is three (3) years, with the option to renew for two (2) additional one-year terms.
17. **Question:** Can you talk about the evaluation team and what their role will be? Will their agencies be using the contract?
- Answer:** The evaluation team currently consists of City of Mesquite, City of Houston, Harford County Public Schools, City of Chicago and Emory University and is subject to change. The evaluation team is responsible for scoring proposals and making a recommendation for award. The evaluation team is not required to purchase from this contract.
18. **Question:** Has U.S. Communities ever awarded this type of contract?
- Answer:** No.
19. **Question:** On page 20, Company information, is item 8 the same as references or are they different?
- Answer:** They are different.
20. **Question:** On page 33, please explain 8.1.h further.
- Answer:** Supplier is required to detail how it will substantiate any price increases during the term of this contract.
21. **Question:** Is there a preference between a single award versus a consortium of vendors?

Answer: See answer to question 8.

22. Question: Who is expected to cover the cost of administration and marketing? What are the minimum requirements in marketing? What will U.S. Communities do to market this contract?

Answer: Supplier is required to covers its cost to administer and market this contract. Refer to Supplier Commitments, paragraph 5(d), Sales Commitment, (pages 12-14) of the solicitation for marketing requirements. U.S. Communities' role is to:

1. Educate Participating Public Agencies about the program;
2. Remove barriers for Participating Public Agencies to use the program;
3. Open doors for the Supplier; and
4. Train and educate Supplier.

It is the Supplier's responsibility to prove the value of its offering to Participating Public Agencies.

23. Question: If we have another coop contract, will that eliminate a proposer?

Answer: No. Supplier must have an exit strategy for any multi-state cooperative contract. Supplier must meet the Supplier Commitments on pages 10-14 of the solicitation and lead with U.S. Communities to public agencies. This includes states, local governments, school districts, higher education institutions and nonprofits.

24. Question: We are a part of a healthcare GPO and some city/county owned hospitals use it. Is this acceptable?

Answer: Supplier must meet the Supplier Commitments on pages 10-14 of the solicitation and lead with U.S. Communities to public agencies. This includes states, local governments, school districts, higher education institutions and nonprofits.

25. Question: In the future, will it be feasible that other vendors could be added to this contract?

Answer: Once awarded, additional suppliers will not be added throughout the term of the contract. The only exception would be if the successful supplier is unable to complete its obligation under the solicitation and the City has to revert to the second low bidder after the initial award. This only occurs in rare circumstances.

26. Question: You mentioned that the current City contract will expire. How much will you focus on the City needs versus focusing on general needs of the contract for other entities? It is a higher priority but it is not the only concern, is that right?

Answer: The needs of both the City of Mesquite and Participating Public Agencies will be taken into consideration for this contract. City staff will make a recommendation regarding this contract based on the evaluation committee. The City Council will make the award based on staff's recommendation but also considering their view of what is best for the City of Mesquite.

27. **Question:** Are you looking for a Performance Energy contract or an Energy Consulting contract? Page 6, 3.C., is “the plan” for a performance plan or a consulting plan?
- Answer:** The scope of this solicitation is for Comprehensive Energy Consulting and Management Services. This is NOT an Energy Performance solicitation. If Supplier offers consulting for energy efficiency, it would be considered. On Page 6, 3.C., “the plan” refers to a consulting plan.
28. **Question:** As a lead agency in this contract, is that something (performance energy) you will take into consideration?
- Answer:** See answer to question 27.
29. **Question:** What percent does the vendor pay to U.S. Communities?
- Answer:** Upon award, Supplier will negotiate this percentage.
30. **Question:** On page 33, paragraph 8.1.a., the term “may” implies that I can take that into consideration. Why is the consulting portion being awarded by volume metrics and not fixed?
- Answer:** The City currently uses a contract which is based on volume metrics. The City will take into consideration other methodologies for pricing. Pricing formulas should be quantifiable so the City can determine its annual cost for energy consulting.
31. **Question:** Can tiered pricing be submitted?
- Answer:** Yes.
32. **Question:** Is there any HUB requirement for this? Can U.S. Communities add HUB vendors for if they wanted to?
- Answer:** No. Awarded Supplier(s) may work with HUB vendors to meet Participating Public Agency needs.
33. **Question:** Is a cost plus rate acceptable?
- Answer:** See answer to question 30.
34. **Question:** What is the benefit of a master contract if we have to negotiate a performance contract with each entity? I do not see a provision to allow pricing for this service.
- Answer:** This is not an Energy Performance solicitation.
35. **Question:** Is there a conflict of interest between consultant and performance contract? You may want to think about clarifying what you want.

Answer: See answer to question 27.

36. Question: Can you please provide the ESI ID that you are requesting rates?

Answer: The City's electricity consumption is shown in question 13. The City has approximately 422 electricity accounts each of which has an ESI ID number.

37. Question: Items C and D of the Supplier Qualifications worksheet stipulate the following: "C. Does your company have a national sales force, dealer network or distributor with the ability to call on Participating Public Agencies in at least 15 US states? D. Did your company have sales greater than \$20 million last year in the United States?" Is there any way that firms that do not meet these two criteria, but can demonstrate sufficient qualifications in a subset of the desired services (such as DSM services), can participate in this solicitation?

Answer: See answer to question 7. Supplier is encouraged to team with other companies and clearly articulate in its proposal Supplier's national capability to actively promote the Master Agreement and service Participating Public Agencies across the United States.

38. Question: Will teams of consultants be allowed to submit on this opportunity, or are you looking for one large firm with the national capacity and expertise to deliver on the entire scope? If teaming is permitted, is there a mechanism for us to find out what other firms may be pursuing this and if they may be looking for sub-consultants? Are there any goals to include DBEs in this selection?

Answer: See answer to question 37. Included in this Addendum are the participants, along with contact information, from the Pre-Proposal conference. There are no DBE goals.

39. Question: Section 5.1 in Exhibit 2 to the Administration Agreement discusses the Alliance's application of "a monthly administrative fee based upon the total sales price of all purchases shipped and billed pursuant to the Master Agreement."

- a. Please confirm that each respondent is to propose a percentage amount for the Administrative Fee as part of its response to the Solicitation.
- b. Please discuss how each respondent's recommended Administrative Fee as part of its percentage will be used in the Alliance's evaluation of prospective suppliers.

Answer: Please see the answer to question 29. The Administrative fee will not be a part of the evaluation criteria. Reference Proposal Information, paragraph 14, Criteria for Evaluation in the solicitation.

40. Question: The scope of work provided in the Solicitation includes the implementation of energy efficiency and demand reduction projects (the "Projects"). We are fully capable of providing the Projects, however the Solicitation's terms and conditions do not appear suitable for the delivery of such Projects in the form of an energy performance contract.

- a. Is it the Alliance's intent to allow for the delivery of the Project in the form of a performance contract and if so how does it envision addressing the appropriate terms and conditions for performance contracts within the contractual documents?

- b. Please discuss the Alliance's position on including the Projects in the awarded scope of work, but not providing such work as part of an energy performance contract.

Answer: See answer to question 27.

41. Question: Please present the Alliance's ongoing responsibilities in the identification, sale and contracting of services to Alliance members. For instance, does the Alliance envision that it will be involved at any level in the negotiation of transactions and contracts between the selected supplier and Alliance members? If yes, what specific role (or roles) will the Alliance play and how will differences between the selected supplier and the Alliance be resolved?

Answer: U.S. Communities role is to

1. Educate Participating Public Agencies about the program;
2. Remove barriers for Participating Public Agencies to use the program;
3. Open doors for the Supplier; and
4. Train and educate Supplier.

It is the Supplier's responsibility to prove the value of its offering to Participating Public Agencies. U.S. Communities does not negotiate transactions between Supplier and Participating Public Agencies.

42. Question: Please discuss any incentives that Alliance sales personnel will receive from the sale of services to Alliance members. For instance, will Alliance sales personnel receive a commission on the selected supplier's sale of services to Alliance members? If so, please confirm that such commission is included in the Administrative Fees referenced in the Administrative Agreement, Article V Section 5.1.

Answer: U.S. Communities Program Managers do not receive commissions.

43. Question: Please provide the details of scope of services provided by the City of Mesquite's current electricity consultant.

Answer: The City's current consultant provides advice on the electricity market as follows: 1. Evaluates current market conditions, market risk and opportunities and identifies energy procurement strategies; 2. Recommends timing of bids for electricity procurement and oversees the solicitation process; 3. Negotiates contracts; 4. Analyzes retail provider's rates and programs; 5. Assists with management of day-to-day details of the City's electricity accounts including verifying the accuracy of invoice billings when questions arise; 6. Assists the City with issues regarding adding, transferring and deleting electricity accounts and coordinates activities with the local electric distribution provider (ONCOR); 7. Assists the City with preparation of consumption reports required by regulatory agencies; and 8. Provides other electricity advice and consultation as requested by the City.

44. Question: What happens to the unsuccessful bids? Does the U.S. Communities/City of Mesquite keep a short list of unsuccessful bids for future consideration?

Answer: There have been instances in which a successful bidder was unable to complete their obligation under a bid or RFP and the City has had to revert to the second low bidder

after the initial award. This only occurs in rare circumstances. Normally a new bid or RFP would be developed and new proposals taken.

45. Question: Does the City of Mesquite and/or other participating public agencies have any defined technology/product roadmaps to follow – that may be relevant to the engagement?

Answer: No.

46. Question: What are the current risk mitigation policies of the City of Mesquite and/or other participating public agencies?

Answer: The City depends on its energy consultant to provide advice regarding market risk for the electricity market and to recommend a strategy to minimize the City's exposure to uncertainty in the market.

47. Question: Please list the key concerns in the energy management and related areas that the City of Mesquite and/or other participating public agencies have at this time.

Answer: For the City of Mesquite, the issues discussed in the answer to Question 43 are the main concern. Concerns from other public agencies are not known at this time.

48. Question: What kind of data will be made available to the consultant in "Analyzing, defining, and monitoring all elements of energy exposure as well as understanding consumption, including (but not limited to) the consumption of electricity, natural gas and refined products (such as heating oil, gasoline and diesel) and the emission of greenhouse gases."

Answer: It is up to each Participating Public Agency to determine available data that will be provided to awarded Supplier(s).

49. Question: "Supplier would be required to match the lower state pricing under the Master Agreement and make it available to all Public Agencies within that state." – How will this be monitored and ensured?

Answer: U.S. Communities will monitor the contract nationwide and conduct Quarterly Reviews with suppliers to ensure compliance with the commitments of the contract. However, the City of Mesquite will address any issues or complaints received from Participating Public Agencies with the successful Supplier(s).

50. Question: Given the broadly defined scope, fixed pricing may be difficult. Will the time and material with a labor rate do instead?

Answer: See answer to Question 30.

51. Question: What is the range of percentages of Administration Fees in existing U.S. Commodities Agreements? Can you characterize if there is a difference and add color around differences between commodity type arrangements and expert professional advisory

services types of agreements? Is there a minimum threshold percentage which U.S. Commodities would view as acceptable?

Answer: This will be U.S. Communities' first professional services only contract so no historical information is available. For Product contracts we typically receive an Administrative fee of 2%. See answer to question 29.

52. Question: Please clarify whether the City of Mesquite intends to award a contract to the supplier that best fits its needs or whether they intend to award a contract to the supplier or suppliers with the best combination of services and national coverage necessary to meet the objectives of U.S. Communities. These two objectives are mutually exclusive.

Answer: These two objectives are not mutually exclusive. See answer to Question 26.

53. Question: In section 3 of the Introduction, the solicitation indicates that suppliers are to "propose the broadest possible selection of comprehensive energy consulting and management services they offer". Based on this, can a supplier provide fewer services than another company and still be awarded a contract?

Answer: Supplier should be able to perform the Services outlined in paragraph 3, General Definition of Services and Solutions. Supplier is encouraged to team with other companies if it cannot provide all the Services and clearly articulate in its proposal Supplier's national capability to actively promote the Master Agreement and service Participating Public Agencies across the United States.

54. Question: Is it possible for a company to bid and not provide all of the services described in the solicitation and still be awarded a contract?

Answer: See answer to Question 53.

55. Question: Will all of the Advisory Board members actively participate in the product service bid selection, or is it possible that the City of Mesquite may make the decision without Board Member participation?

Answer: See answer to Question 17.

56. Question: Have all of the US Communities Advisory Board Member organizations committed to using the Master Agreement for their energy procurement/management services under the term of this contract?

Answer: See answer to Question 10.

57. Question: Multiple awards will be necessary for the success of this program because of the pool of companies that are able and licensed to provide ESCO and procurement services for the City of Mesquite, Texas is not the same for all U.S. Communities members. Can Section 4, U.S. Communities, Multiple Awards on page 9 be amended to state multiple awards will be issued so that suppliers not able or licensed to provide ESCO and procurement services for the City of Mesquite, Texas but capable of delivering these services elsewhere know that they have an opportunity to win an award?

Answer: No. See answers to Questions 8 and 27.

58. Question: Based on Question 57, what steps will U.S. Communities take to assure that all markets in the U.S. will benefit from any awarded contracts from this solicitation?

Answer: The City and the evaluation team will determine which Supplier(s) is most qualified to meet the needs of Participating Public Agencies nationwide.

59. Question: Under the evaluation of proposals section, the solicitation notes that “proposals will be evaluated by the Lead Public Agency (City of Mesquite) in accordance with, and subject to the relevant statues, ordinances, rules and regulations that govern its procurement practices.” That being said, what steps is U.S. Communities taking to ensure that these same requirements are met for all member organizations across the country?

Answer: Reference Master Intergovernmental Cooperative Purchasing Agreement (MICPA) which can be found in Exhibit 2 of the solicitation.

60. Question: Does U.S. Communities anticipate earning a commission from existing customer business moved to the Master Agreement by the winning supplier(s)?

Answer: The Administrative Fee, not a commission, will apply to all sales under the Master Agreement.

61. Question: Does U.S. Communities receive any fee from use of this contract? The line is blank in the Master Agreement. What is the fee?

Answer: See answer to Question 29.

62. Question: Section 5, Suppliers, Commitments, (a) Corporate Commitment, (i) of the solicitation states that, “The pricing, terms and conditions of the Master Agreement shall, at all times, be Supplier’s primary contractual offering of Products and Services to Public Agencies.” Most suppliers on existing state contracts have a requirement or are expected to utilize the State contract since they generate fees for the State. Agreeing to make this the primary contractual offering would create significant and intractable conflict of interest. Can Section 5, Suppliers, Commitments, (a) Corporate Commitment, (i) on page 10 be deleted?

Answer: No.

63. Question: Section 5, Suppliers, Commitments, (a) Corporate Commitment, (iv) of the solicitation states that, “Supplier shall transition such Public Agency to the pricing, terms and conditions of the Master Agreement.” No State or public entity outside of Texas can utilize this contract since the Governing Law for the Master Agreement is the State of Texas. Each public entity will require the governing law to be their State’s. The Master Agreement must be amended to allow the Governing Law to change.

Answer: See answer to Question 59.

64. Question: Section 5, Suppliers, Commitments, (a) Corporate Commitment, (viii) of the solicitation states that “where supplier has an existing contract for products and services with a state, Supplier shall notify the state of the Master Agreement and transition the state to the pricing, terms and conditions of the Master Agreement upon the State’s request...” This requirement can be met by merely notifying the state of the Master Agreement but since the Master Agreement to most Sates is not complementary but rather a competing contracting vehicle this notification will only serve as a notice to a State that a supplier has a conflict of interest. Can Section 5, Suppliers, Commitments, (a) Corporate Commitment, (viii) on page 11 be deleted?

Answer: No.

65. Question: Section 5, Suppliers, Commitments, (b) Pricing Commitment (i) of the solicitation states that “Supplier represents to U.S. Communities that the pricing offered under the Master Agreement is the lowest overall available pricing(net to purchaser) on Products and Services that it offers to Public Agencies.” Making such a representation will be highly problematic to any large, national Supplier for a number of reasons. First of all, many existing Supplier contracts with Public Agencies have minimum guaranteed volumes and/or volume discounts. Since this opportunity has neither, offering a similar low price without a guaranteed volume does not make good business sense. Secondly, all public agency contracts have unique terms and conditions, technical requirements, reporting requirements, etc. These differences have real cost implications for a Supplier. Therefore, representing that the prices offered in the Master Agreement are the lowest ignores the fact that the services being offered for the price are significantly different. Can Section 5, Suppliers, Commitments, (b) Pricing Commitment (i) on page 11 be deleted or amended to allow prices to be adjusted based on specific customer requirements?

Answer: No.

66. Question: Section 5, Suppliers, Commitments, (b) Pricing Commitment (ii) of the solicitation states that, “pre-existing contract and/or a Public Agency’s unique buying pattern provide one or more Public Agencies a lower price than that offered under the Master Agreement, Supplier shall match that lower pricing under the Master Agreement and inform the eligible Public Agencies that the lower pricing is available under the Master Agreement.” Since a Supplier’s prices reflect a customer’s unique terms and conditions, technical requirements, reporting requirements, accounts, annual usage, etc. matching a fee from another public agency contract in the Master Agreement is not financially acceptable without the ability to normalize the price based on specific service offerings. Can Section 5, Suppliers, Commitments, (b) Pricing Commitment (i) on page 11 be deleted or amended to allow prices to be adjusted based on specific customer requirements?

Answer: No.

67. Question: Section 5, Suppliers, Commitments, (b) Pricing Commitment (iii) of the solicitation identifies “possible occasional deviating buying patterns”. Since all customers are unique in their requirements, how does the City/Board anticipate accommodating these differences in the evaluation process of the fee proposals?

Answer: See answer to Question 6.

68. Question: Section 5, Suppliers, Commitments, (b) Pricing Commitment (iv) provides options to responding to a public agency solicitation. Part (A) indicates that the Supplier may opt not to respond to the procurement solicitation and make the Master Agreement available to the public agency as a comparison. The issuing public agency will deem this to be non-responsive and disqualify the Supplier's response. This is not a viable business option. Can Section 5, Suppliers, Commitments, (b) Pricing Commitment (iv), (A) on page 12 be deleted?

Answer: No.

69. Question: Section 5, Suppliers, Commitments, (b) Pricing Commitment (iv) provides options to responding to a to a public agency solicitation. Part (B) indicates that the Supplier may respond to the procurement solicitation with the "pricing, terms and conditions of the Master Agreement." The issuing public agency will deem this to be non-responsive and disqualify the Supplier's response. This is not a viable business option. Can Section 5, Suppliers, Commitments, (b) Pricing Commitment (iv), (B) on page 12 be deleted?

Answer: No.

70. Question: Section 5, Suppliers, Commitments, (b) Pricing Commitment (iv) provides options to responding to a to a public agency solicitation. Part (C) indicates that the Supplier may respond to the procurement solicitation with "lower pricing through the Master Agreement." Since the Master Agreement contains different terms and conditions, the issuing public agency will deem this to be non-responsive and disqualify the Supplier's response. This is not a viable business option. Can Section 5, Suppliers, Commitments, (b) Pricing Commitment (iv), (C) on page 12 be deleted?

Answer: No.

71. Question: Section 5, Suppliers, Commitments, (d) Sales Commitment states that a "Supplier's sales force compensation and incentives shall be greater than or equal to the compensation and incentives earned under other contracts to Public Agencies." Since compensation and incentives are typically driven by revenue, this would require a company to increase the compensation percentage for Master Agreement sales. Does the City/Board believe that they should dictate corporate compensation and incentives to the supplier's sales force? How will the City/Board enforce this? Will the City/Board require a Supplier to provide them with updated compensation plans for review and approval?

Answer: This is a requirement to eliminate any potential barrier of the Supplier's sales force commitment to lead with U.S. Communities as its primary offering to Public Agencies. U.S. Communities will ask Supplier's corporate leadership directly to describe sales force compensation under the U.S. Communities contract compared to standard Supplier sales force compensation. In addition, compensation barriers typically come to light quickly when we interact with the Supplier's sales force. Supplier is required to keep U.S. Communities apprised of any compensation changes relating to its ability to lead with U.S. Communities as its primary offering to Public Agencies.

72. **Question:** Section 8. Cost Proposal Instructions, 8.1, states that a "Proposer shall describe in detail all services being offered. Proposer shall submit its fee schedule in a manner that allows for clear calculation of price based on one or more criteria." Since each proposer can select their own factors (i.e., usage, accounts, reports, etc.) how can the City/Board compare different offerings and be certain that they can determine the lowest price?

Answer: Pricing formulas should be quantifiable so the City can determine its annual cost for energy consulting and compare Suppliers' proposals.

73. **Question:** Due to the importance of the questions presented here, would the City/Council consider extending the date on which the proposals are due?

Answer: At this time, the closing date remains Thursday, April 18, 2013, 2:00 pm central time.

Included in this addendum as **Attachment 1** is a list of bidders who participated in the Pre-Proposal Conference.



Le Sealey
Manager of Purchasing

ACCEPTANCE:

We, the undersigned, do hereby acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 1 to RFP No. 2013-069; Comprehensive Energy Consulting and Management Services and agree to the instructions herein written.

Company Name

Authorized Signature

Date

Attachment 1

RFP No. 2013-069

Comprehensive Energy Consulting
and Management Services

Pre-Bid Sign In Sheet

Pre-Bid Date: 4-3-2013

Pre-Bid Time: 9:00 a.m.

Bid Opens: 4-18-2013

PLEASE WRITE LEGIBLY

Name	Company Name & Address	Phone No.	Fax No.	Mobile No.	Email Address
Brent Hendrickson	Nexant Inc 1805 Old Alabama Road Suite 315 Roswell, GA 30076			404-276-9008	Bhendrickson@Nexant.com
Andy McCartney	BLACK & VEATCH 1300 Summit Ave Suite 400 Fort Worth, TX 76102			817-475-5813	mcartneya@bv.com
Joe Pursley	Energy systems Group 101 West Buckingham #136 Richardson TX 75081		812-492- 8455	214-250-2086	JPursley@EnergySystemsGroup.com
Valiya Agrawal	Nexant, Inc. 3805 Landsdowne Drive McKinney, TX 75070			972-519- 7019	lagrawal@Nexant.com
STEVE SAIN	SAIN ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, INC. 100 CORPORATE PARKWAY, SUITE 100 BIRMINGHAM, AL 35242		205-979- 9936	205-249- 5300	Steve.Sain@saineng.com
Jim Diemer	PACE Global, Siemens 1415 Louisiana St Suite 350 Houston TX 77002			703 608 5554	James.diemer@Siemens.com
Dan Statton	Navigant Consulting Inc 99 San Jacinto Blvd, Suite 900 Austin, TX 78701		512- 472-7721	512-426- 1218	dstatton@navigant.com

RFP No. 2013-069
 Comprehensive Energy Consulting
 and Management Services

Pre-Bid Sign In Sheet
 Pre-Bid Date: 4-3-2013
 Pre-Bid Time: 9:00 a.m.
 Bid Opens: 4-18-2013

PLEASE WRITE LEGIBLY

Name	Company Name & Address	Phone No.	Fax No.	Mobile No.	Email Address
Bob Wooten	Tradition Energy 3050 East Gate Houston, TX	713-608- 9429		713-306- 5949	bob.wooten@tradition energy.com
JIM NIEWALD	ICF INTERNATIONAL 7160 N. DALLAS PKW. PLANO, TX	469- 467- 4415			JIM.NIEWALD@ICF.COM
MARCUS JOHNSON	NEXTEA ENERGY 16683 DALLAS PKWY #600 ADDISSON TX 75001	972 834-9402			MARCUS.F.JOHNSON@ NEXTEAENERGY.COM
Tom KIRK-DAVIS	MERUI 9824 BOAT BARN LN DALLAS, TX 75243 REPRESENTING: AMERICAN ENERGY	978-479-1722		978-570- 8450	clous445@aol.com
CHRIS ELLIOTT	Amerex Energy Services 1 Sugar Creek Ctr Blvd #700 Sugar Land TX 77478	281 340-5222		832 455 6410	elliott@amerexenergy. com

RFP No. 2013-069
 Comprehensive Energy Consulting
 and Management Services

Pre-Bid Sign In Sheet
 Pre-Bid Date: 4-3-2013
 Pre-Bid Time: 9:00 a.m.
 Bid Opens: 4-18-2013

PLEASE WRITE LEGIBLY

Name	Company Name & Address	Phone No.	Fax No.	Mobile No.	Email Address
Paul Ward	SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC	972- 629- 5861	866- 314- 7770	214- 546- 9754	PAUL.WARD@ EMS.SCHNEIDER- ELECTRIC.COM
Michael Sweeney	ARUP	310.404. 1037	310.577 7011	310.404. 1037	Michael.Sweeney @ARUP.COM
Sonya York	Schneider Electric	214 686-0306	866 314-7770	214 686-0306	Sonya.york@ ems.schneider-electric .com
MAHESH THAROOR	JOHNSON CONTROLS	972 754-9613	972 869-9421	972 754-9613	malesh.tharoor@ jci.com
Mary Pelfrey	U.S. Communities	704 564-0320	866 866	704 564 0320	mpelfrey@uscommunities.org
Don Simons	City of Mesquite	214- 808-2142		214- 808-2142	dsimons@ci.mesquitetrx.us
Le Sealey	City of Mesquite	972-216 6394	972-216 6397	... ---	lsealey@cityofmesquite.com