

UPDATE:

1

Request for Proposal

-

Services and Operations Complementary to the Great Falls Animal Shelter

March 3, 2019

- **BACKGROUND;**

2

February 2019; the City Commissioners consented to the suggestion of Commissioner Robinson to explore a potential partnership with the Maclean-Cameron Animal Adoption Center (MCAAC). The initial exploration was conducted by Commissioner Robinson and Commissioner Moe.

July 2, 2019; Commissioners Robinson and Moe reported that they had gone as far as they could go with the initiative and, without objection from the rest of the Commission, directed staff to take over exploration efforts.

July – September 2019; City staff, as well as City Manager Doyon met with MCAAC representatives and contacted numerous local and national agencies to gather information on industry operations and best practices, to ascertain the formation of a partnership.

October 2019; To facilitate the direction, with Commissioner input, the City Manager crafted a Request for Proposal for Services and Operations Complementary to the Great Falls Animal Shelter (GFAS).

3

- **BACKGROUND:**

- The GFAS is an open-admission, municipal animal shelter operated by the City of Great Falls, and requirements contained in Montana Code Annotated (MCA), Title 7, Chapter 23, and local ordinances. The GFAS is required to provide a location for all stray, abandoned, and owner surrendered animals, and serves the residents of Great Falls, Cascade County and the surrounding areas.

- GFAS provides a number of services; animal protection, animal adoptions, education/outreach, cremation services for veterinarians and private citizens, as well as spay/neuter, licensing and microchipping services. The Shelter also has volunteer opportunities and currently has over 320 volunteers that assist with the animals and other events and activities throughout the year.

- The MCAAC and the GFAS both offer similar services to the community, but there are differences in the services they provide, and the requirements that dictate the services they offer.

4

- **BACKGROUND:**

- The RFP was not directed toward a sole entity, but was broadly advertised to solicit the greatest input.

- The RFP was specific, and approved by the Commission at the November 5th, 2019 work session. The approval included three qualifications that were to be met for successful consideration.

- *Provide at least the same quality of care as currently provided by the GFAS;*
- *Not create inefficiencies or gaps in service between the duties assumed by the proposing body and those retained by GFAS; and*
- *Result in substantial savings to the City of Great Falls*

- The RFP was originally due on 8 January 2020, and the due date extended 45 days to 24 February 2020.

- One submission was received from the Maclean Cameron Animal Adoption Center.

- INITIAL ANALYSIS/FINDINGS

Section 1 – Proponent Information -- Responsive

Section 2 – Statement of Intent-- Responsive, with comments

- Applicant did not explain *their* challenges as requested in the RFP.
- Applicant answered expansion of their services and facility *caveated* upon them being awarded a service contract. The applicant did not explain if they had any other service/facility expansions in their current long range plans.

Section 3 – Animal Welfare Services Proposed -- Response Concerns

- The requirements of the RFP stated a successful proposal must establish that the proposed complementary services would meet three standards (quality of care, not create inefficiencies/gaps in service, and result in substantial savings to the City).

-- Section 3, para 2, proposes the “Center to assume all responsibility for animal adoption and fostering services, fundraising, and education to the community. The City would retain responsibility for the intake and timely release of strays along with statutory responsibility for animal control services.” But in Section 4, para 1, the proposal “offers a service contract at an initial flat fee of \$475,000, and the City MUST close all operations of the GFAS.”

--RFP Requirement #1, #2, and #3 not met

- INITIAL ANALYSIS/FINDINGS:

Section 3 – Animal Welfare Services Proposed (continued)

- Section 3, question 1 response; proposes the “Center would no longer accept strays.”

-- RFP Requirement #1 and #2 not met

- Section 3, question 4 response; proposes that the animals to be served are dogs, puppies, cats, and kittens as well as unclaimed strays turned over to the MCAAC from the GFAS.

-- RFP Requirement #1, #2, and #3 not met

-- Note: Incongruent statement. Animals cannot be turned to the MCAAC if the service contract requirement proposed is to close the GFAS?

- Section 3, question 8 response; proposes the “Center should not be required to accommodate large turn-ins of animals seized from animal hoarders.”

-- RFP Requirement #1, #2, and #3 not met

- Section 3, question 8 response; states the foundation “does not believe it should assume any responsibility for cremation. The City has committed to building a new incinerator and there are other options available in the private sector.”

-- RFP Requirement #1, #2, and #3 not met

-- Note: Incongruent statement. Cremation services cannot be obtained at the GFAS if the service contract requirement proposed is to close the GFAS?

- **INITIAL ANALYSIS/FINDINGS:**

Section 3 – Animal Welfare Services Proposed (continued)

- Section 3, question 9 asks for a timeline detailing the timeframe and steps needed to provide the service. The response states the foundation “would be prepared to begin a contractual arrangement on July 1, 2020.” No steps to reach this were provided.
 - *RFP Requirement #2 not met*
- Section 3, query 12 response; states that all “qualifying animals will be taken to the MCAAC at which time the MCAAC will assume ownership.
 - *RFP Requirement #1, #2, and #3 not met*
 - *Note: Incongruent statement. Qualifying animals cannot be taken to the MCAAC if the service contract requirement proposed is to close the GFAS?*

- **INITIAL ANALYSIS/FINDINGS:**

Section 4 – Service Cost and Financial Requirements -- Response Concerns

- Section 4, query 2 response; states “the GFAS closes all operation the MCAAC proposed an initial service contract price off \$475,000 adjusted annually by the CPI” and additionally stated if the GFAS is not closed, the MCAAC cannot propose an initial contract price without knowing the level of services that the City would maintain and the costs and income associated with such services.....absent a full understanding of the City’s cost for it’s retained services.”
 - *RFP Requirement #1, #2, #3 not met*
 - *The RFP asked for submissions for complementary services and operations during the initial 54-day timeline. The commission then approved a MCAAC requested 45-day extension request. The RFP Addendums #2 and #3 included “by line item” expense ledger detail, complete budget information for 2008-2019, as well as detailed responses to specific questions about expenses.*
- *Note: Incongruent statement. The MCAAC relays throughout the proposal that they are a viable and well functioning alternative to the GFAS. They operate and provide some of the same services that the GFAS does. The proposal states the MCAAC would assume all responsibility for animal adoption and fostering services, fundraising, and education to the community. These are services that they currently provide. How could they not determine their costs associated with services they already provide?*

• INITIAL ANALYSIS/FINDINGS:

Section 4 – Service Cost and Financial Requirements (continued)

-- Section 4, query 3 response; states “the Center will utilize the services of the GFAS for animal cremation needs at a price discounted from retail.”

-- RFP Requirement #2 and #3 not met

--Note: *Incongruent statement. Cremation services cannot be offered to the community if the service contract requirement proposed is to close the GFAS.*

-- Section 4, query 4; when asked to provide detail about the organizations budget for the past five years, the MCAAC provided only basic information on revenue, expenses, and debt service; see next slide. The MCAAC did relay that they do not have any endowment at this time, and upon completion of all debt payments the foundation hopes to establish an endowment.

**The Animal Foundation of Great Falls
Budget**

	Fiscal Year 11-1-14 to 10-31-15	Fiscal Year 11-1-15 to 10-31-16	Fiscal Year 11-1-16 to 10-31-17	Fiscal Year 11-1-17 to 10-31-18	Fiscal Year 11-1-18 to 10-31-19
Revenue					
Donation, grants, bequest and fund raising events	906,997.00	295,000.00	1,317,000.00	1,135,000.00	447,000.00
Program revenue (adoption center/education)	14,000.00	85,000.00	91,000.00	91,000.00	126,000.00
Total Revenue	920,997.00	380,000.00	1,408,000.00	1,226,000.00	573,000.00
Expenses					
Animal Care and Boarding	24,000.00	40,000.00	45,000.00	58,000.00	64,000.00
Salaries and Benefits	128,000.00	254,000.00	288,000.00	302,000.00	309,000.00
Occupancy Costs (ins., repairs, taxes, utilities, etc)	76,000.00	78,000.00	89,000.00	91,000.00	99,000.00
Other Overhead Costs	86,997.00	65,000.00	78,000.00	68,000.00	72,000.00
Total Expenses	314,997.00	437,000.00	500,000.00	519,000.00	544,000.00
Net Operating Income	606,000.00	(57,000.00)	908,000.00	707,000.00	29,000.00
Debt Service	1,456,000.00	42,000.00	(694,000.00)	(860,000.00)	(24,000.00)
Construction and equipment costs	(2,800,000.00)	(76,000.00)			
Endowment	-	-	-	-	-
Beginning Cash	(738,000.00)	(15,000.00)	214,000.00	(183,000.00)	5,000.00
Ending Cash	828,000.00	88,000.00	73,000.00	287,000.00	104,000.00
Ending Cash	88,000.00	73,000.00	287,000.00	104,000.00	109,000.00

- **INITIAL ANALYSIS/FINDINGS:**

Section 5 – References -- Responsive

SUMMARY:

- The proposal received was difficult to interpret, and understand. The City did not request any closure of the GFAS. The RFP asked for complementary services and operations options. Instead, the City received 1 option (close and pay an unsubstantiated fee) and a confusing request to continue negotiations about information that should have been provided in the proposal.
- The proposal contradicts itself by listing a \$475,000 dollar figure for the MCAAC to provide their reduced services to the community. That is caveated by the requirement to close the GFAS, but on numerous paragraphs the MCAAC relays that they need the GFAS to provide services.
- This is only a preliminary analysis. The flaws, contradictory statements, and lack of detail is only a sampling of the essence contained in the document.

- **COMMISSION OPTIONS:**

- Have staff provide a full report detailing the concerns about the proposal at a future work session
 - This will allow staff time to fully analyze, research, and provide a detailed list of potential impacts from a financial, operational, and legal perspective.
- Continue to negotiate with the MCAAC based on the proposal submitted
 - Due to the public interest and attention on this subject, it is recommended this effort be led by 2 commissioners at future public meetings
 - This will also allow staff to request the MCAAC provide the line item detail and specification missing from the submission.
- Find that the proposal was non-responsive, due to the numerous conflicts and lack of information, and reject the RFP
 - The submitted proposal reveals and validates that shutting down the GFAS is not a viable option. A rejection of the RFP will not negatively impact the MCAAC or GFAS, or our community.