

MEMO

CONSULTANT TEAM

TO: Energy Efficiency Council
FROM: EEC Consultant Team
CC: Office of Energy Resources
DATE: March 21, 2024
RE: EEC Public Awareness Campaign Vendor Recommendation Memo



PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS

On July 24, 2023, the Energy Efficiency Council (EEC) issued Request for Proposals (RFP) number EERMC-2023-01 titled “EERMC Energy Efficiency and Climate Public Awareness Campaign”. On September 18, 2023, four (4) proposals were received. Council members Priscilla De La Cruz, Joe Garlick, and Peter Gill Case volunteered to serve as the Technical Review Team and reviewed all proposals.

On November 16, 2023, the Council voted to revise and re-issue RFP number EERMC-2023-01 due to a scoring protocol technicality relating to ISBE certification, which refers to Minority Business Enterprises (MBE), Women Business Enterprises (WBE), and Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE). Specific language amendments were made under the guidance and approval of EEC legal counsel.

On January 29, 2024, the EEC issued the updated RFP, number EERMC-2024-01 titled “EERMC Energy Efficiency and Climate Public Awareness Campaign.” On February 19, 2024, six (6) proposals were received, including submissions from all previous respondents. Council members Priscilla De La Cruz, Joe Garlick, and Peter Gill Case volunteered once again to serve as the Technical Review Team and reviewed all proposals.

The valuation was based on the following criteria: Overview and Work Plan (35 points), Qualifications and Experience (25 Points), Project Management and Organization (5 points), Cost Proposal (25 points), and Certifications Component (6 points), for a total of 106 possible points. Interviews were conducted with two (2) vendors that the Technical Review Team wanted to speak with to gather more information before finalizing their technical proposal scores. Following the Technical Review Team’s final scoring of the technical proposals, four (4) of the six (6) proposals did not receive an average technical proposal score of 55 points or greater, therefore they were considered not technically qualified, and the corresponding cost and certification proposals were not opened.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the review process, the Technical Review Team believes that the PivotPath, LLC proposal and overall approach most strongly align with the objectives outlined in the Council’s Public Awareness Campaign RFP. The Technical Review Team proposes that the EEC contract with PivotPath for these services and accept the proposed workplan and timeline as the basis of the contract. The contract should be limited to the hourly rates included in the proposal.

SCORING SUMMARY

AVERAGE	Figmint	KSA	NJA	PivotPath	Systems Change Strategies	Half Street Group	Max Possible
Overview and Work Plan	28.00	19.00	21.33	34.33	19.33	17.33	35
Qualifications and Experience	16.00	13.33	14.00	19.67	15.67	15.33	20
Project Management and Organization	12.00	12.33	10.33	15.00	12.33	12.33	15
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL	56.00	44.67	45.67	69.00	47.33	45.00	70
Cost Proposal	30.00	n/a	n/a	28.05	n/a	n/a	30
Certification Component	6.00	n/a	n/a	6.00	n/a	n/a	6
TOTAL	92.00	44.67	45.67	103.05	47.33	45.00	106

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORES

REVIEWER #1	Figmint	KSA	NJA	PivotPath	Systems Change Strategies	Half Street Group	Max Possible
Overview and Work Plan	25	10	15	35	15	10	35
Qualifications and Experience	15	10	10	20	15	15	20
Project Management and Organization	15	15	10	15	10	10	15
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL	55	35	35	70	40	35	70

REVIEWER #2	Figmint	KSA	NJA	PivotPath	Systems Change Strategies	Half Street Group	Max Possible
Overview and Work Plan	32	25	26	35	20	20	35
Qualifications and Experience	16	15	17	20	15	15	20
Project Management and Organization	12	10	10	15	15	15	15
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL	60	50	53	70	50	50	70

REVIEWER #3	Figmint	KSA	NJA	PivotPath	Systems Change Strategies	Half Street Group	Max Possible
Overview and Work Plan	27	22	23	33	23	22	35
Qualifications and Experience	17	15	15	19	17	16	20
Project Management and Organization	9	12	11	15	12	12	15
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL	53	49	49	67	52	50	70

REVIEW TEAM NOTES

PIVOTPATH

- GA firm; Successful and relevant out-of-state projects;
- Proposal aligns strongly with RFP goals and priorities; EJ/cultural awareness emphasized
- Well-rounded firm and clear deliverables with allocation of work shared with subcontractor
- Feel very confident about their approach and their team's capabilities and capacity

FIGMINTS

- RI firm; Some relevant referrals; Good work plan, but some spelling & grammatical errors
- DEI lens centered; Unsure if translation services are included
- Video capabilities are a plus
- Strong, interview, but would have appreciated an opportunity to meet additional team members
- Thinking outside the box to stretch limited dollars and reach target audiences

NJA

- NJ firm; Excellent presentation, good precedent images, good previous projects
- Thorough and well versed in energy wonkiness (could be a plus and minus)
- Translation services should be included in workplan and balanced project budget

KSA

- RI firm, precedents so-so, satisfactory work plan
- Concise to the point and visually engaging
- Translation of materials to Spanish and Portuguese included in workplan
- Did not interview; Did not receive enough points on technical proposal to be considered technically qualified, therefore cost and ISBE scores were not calculated

SYSTEMS CHANGE STRATEGIES

- RI firm, good work plan
- Good approach to connect with communities
- Interview could have demonstrated more about what makes their firm unique

HALF STREET GROUP

- RI firm, mediocre work plan
- Work plan lacked specifics and approach tailored to the Council's needs
- Did not interview; Did not receive enough points on technical proposal to be considered technically qualified, therefore cost and ISBE scores were not calculated