



# Pacifica School District

375 Reina Del Mar Avenue ★ Pacifica, California ★ 94044  
(650) 738-6600 ★ (650) 557-9672 (fax)

*Preparing Students for an Evolving World*

[www.pacificasd.org](http://www.pacificasd.org)

## MEMORANDUM

Administrative Services

Meeting of

08/24/16

**TO:** Wendy S. Tukloff, Ed.D., Superintendent  
For Board of Trustees

**FROM:** Josephine Peterson, Chief Business Official

**SUBJECT:** Approval of Contract with Enlight for Prop 39 Lighting Retrofits

---

### Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the contract with Enlight for Prop 39 Lighting Retrofits for \$164,264.

### Background

Pacifica School District has a California Energy Commission (CEC)-approved Prop 39 Energy Expenditure Plan (EEP) which authorizes the District to spend up to \$475,500.39 on approved energy efficiency projects. The projects included in the plan are:

1. Retrofit of refrigeration equipment and reinsulation of Walk-in Refrigerator and Freezer at the District Office warehouse
2. Interior and exterior LED lighting fixture retrofits, District-wide
3. Interior T8 fluorescent lamp replacements with LED, District-wide

To date, the District has just completed the reinsulation of the Walk-in units (retrofit of refrigeration equipment was completed in summer 2015) and parking lot lights at Ortega and Ocean Shore, which were completed by Enlight under a maintenance contract. The total cost of these expenditures is approximately \$41,000, and will be deducted in full from Prop 39 allocations.

Originally, the EEP included the first two measures listed above, but the third measure was modified in an amendment (approved October, 2015) from fluorescent lamps to LED lamps. This change was made possible by the incentives offered through the San Mateo County Energy Watch (SMCEW), which yielded net project costs for the interior and exterior LED lighting fixture retrofits (Project 2 listed above) 40-45% below the current market rates.

After CEC approval of the EEP Amendment, the District took the following steps resulting in this recommended action:

1. Reviewed SMCEW's contractor pre-qualification procedures
2. Worked with SMCEW administrator to define measures eligible in program
3. Reviewed procurement process with Kathy Meola, Chief Deputy County Counsel
4. Reviewed procurement process with District's independent auditor
5. Solicited final proposals from 3 SMCEW pre-qualified contractors for defined scope
6. ARC Alternatives analyzed the proposals for the District, and conducted reference checks

### Project Scope

The project scope includes exterior LED wall packs and LED pole lights. The project types and number of fixtures districtwide are summarized in the table at the right, as well as project costs and resulting energy savings.

School	Fixture Quantities			Net Cost	Estimated Energy Savings*
	Exterior Wallpack	Exterior Poles	Interior LED Fixtures		
Cabrillo	14	10	44	\$13,271	\$3,702
IBL	2	32	38	\$20,873	\$4,546
Linda Mar	10	3	260	\$68,850	\$7,074
Ocean Shore	7	0	34	\$7,127	\$2,961
Ortega	6	0	3	\$2,541	\$602
District Office	0	0	21	\$2,853	\$712
Sunset Ridge	15	28	123	\$38,601	\$9,639
Valleamar	0	10	24	\$10,148	\$2,142
<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>547</b>	<b>\$164,264</b>	<b>\$31,378</b>
<b>5.2 Year SPB</b>					

### Recommendation from Arc Alternatives:

The District received proposals for the first year lighting scope from three contractors (Enlight, Lumenature, and AES), all of whom are San Mateo County Energy Watch program pre-qualified contractors. The three proposals covered the same scope and were the same cost. ARC Alternatives conducted reference checks for the 3 contractors, and surveyed bandwidth and availability. Reference contacts for each project were asked a series of questions relating to the performance of the contractor and the resulting end product delivered. All vendors received positive reviews from each contact however only Enlight provided a confirmation of bandwidth and near term availability. After reviewing the proposals and completing the reference checks for each vendor, ARC Alternatives recommends that the District approve the contract with Enlight for Prop 39 Lighting Retrofits for \$164,264

\* SMCEW estimate, more conservative than Prop 39 estimates