



Canyon County, Idaho

Aaron G. Williams II, Director of Constituent Services

Service * Integrity * Leadership

1115 Albany ❖ Caldwell, Idaho 83605 ❖ Telephone: (208) 614-5011

Email: aaron.williams@canyoncounty.id.gov

December 1, 2025

To: Canyon County Commissioners, Animal Shelter RFP Review Committee

Subject: Recommendation of RFP Regarding Animal Shelter Services Within Canyon County

Agenda Date: December 4, 2025

Executive Summary:

The RFP Committee for Animal Shelter Services in Canyon County has recommended Copper Quill Haven as the applicant best suited to operate shelter services within the region. The Committee met twice to thoroughly review all submitted materials and conduct an in-person interview as part of its evaluation process.

Facts and Findings:

West Valley Humane Society (WVHS) has provided animal shelter services in Canyon County since 2011. However, over the past years, community members have expressed growing concerns regarding animal health and wellness, veterinary care, adoption opportunities, and overall shelter operations. In addition, the possibility of WVHS having to close its doors to the public due to insufficient funding prompted public officials to issue a Request for Proposals (RFP).

In response to the RFP, the County received two proposals, one from Copper Quill Haven (CQH) and one from WVHS. Applicants were required to submit a comprehensive packet including a cover letter, table of contents, firm overview, financial reports, relevant experience, similar contract history, customer references, staffing overview, and a statement of approach.

A review committee consisting of leadership representation and officer representation from the City of Caldwell, City of Nampa, and Canyon County evaluated both proposals. Based on the scoring criteria, the committee determined that CQH was the best fit to operate animal shelter services. CQH received a score of 90 out of 100, the highest of the

two applicants. Points were deducted from CQH's score due to the organization's recent establishment as a new nonprofit formed this year as well as they did not initially include a detailed budget regarding personnel cost.

However, despite being newly formed, the team showed a proven track record in both the private and public sectors, which gave the review committee confidence that they could be the right fit for the community. As well as during the interview process, CQH provided the committee with a detailed breakdown of staff and anticipated pay.

Fiscal Implications:

Copper Quill Haven's total budget request from the County and participating Cities is \$993,000, which aligns with the amount already allocated for FY26.

Policy Implications:

The County and participating cities will need to establish a new agreement with CQH to authorize their operation of the shelter and the provision of services within the service area.

Alternatives:

1. Approve the recommendation from the committee
2. Do not approve the recommendation from the committee

Recommendation:

1. Approve the committee's recommendation of selecting Copper Quill Haven as the organization to run shelter services within Canyon County.

Attachments:

RFP Grading Criteria for Copper Quill Haven

RFP Grading Criteria for West Valley Humane Society

RFP CHECKLIST

As provided in Section III.E. of the Request for Proposals, the County intends to preliminarily rank the proposals it receives to determine both responsiveness to the RFP requirements and perceived congruence between each prospective proposal and the County's needs. The County may potentially then arrange supplemental interviews with selected proposers, if deemed necessary by the County, to further distinguish between the proposals.

Although the County intends to rely in part on objective measurements where possible, by submitting a proposal interested consultants acknowledge that the selection process will necessarily turn in large part on purely subjective standards.

The RFPs will be ranked based on the points noted in parentheses assigned to each item listed below. If "does not meet this requirement" is acknowledged, proposer may include an explanation as to why such requirement is not applicable. Inclusion of an explanation does not obligate the County to credit proposer for responding to the item.

1. Proposer complied with RFP technical requirements: 3 bound copies and 1 digital copy of RFP provided, cover letter, table of contents, and overview of firm. (0-5 pts)

Submittal meets this requirement: 5 does not meet this requirement: _____

Grader comment: _____

2. Proposer has the appropriate experience required as outlined in the RFP and provided sufficient evidence of that experience: General experience, list of similar projects, customer reference list, proposed contractor staff, and proposed sub-contractors. (0-25 pts)

Submittal meets this requirement: 20 does not meet this requirement: _____

Grader comment: The committee felt that this organization may have the appropriate experience outlined through their board and references. However, points were deducted due to the fact that this organization was recently started.

3. Proposer has included references. Score based on inclusion and content of references. (0-10 pts)

Submittal meets this requirement: 10 does not meet this requirement: _____

Grader comment: _____

4. **Proposer has included Section II. I. Statement of Approach referencing the Scope of Services. (0-25 pts)**

Submittal meets this requirement: 25 does not meet this requirement: _____

Grader comment: _____

5. **Cost. (0-25 pts)**

Submittal meets this requirement: 20 does not meet this requirement: _____

Grader comment: The committee deducted points due to the fact that the Proposer did not include a detailed budget for personal costs.

6. **Perceived congruence of Proposer's solution with the County's needs. (0-10 pts)**

Submittal meets this requirement: 10 does not meet this requirement: _____

Grader comment: _____

Point Total: 90 / 100

Preliminary Ranking: 1 / 2

Additional Grader Comments:

RFP CHECKLIST

As provided in Section III.E. of the Request for Proposals, the County intends to preliminarily rank the proposals it receives to determine both responsiveness to the RFP requirements and perceived congruence between each prospective proposal and the County's needs. The County may potentially then arrange supplemental interviews with selected proposers, if deemed necessary by the County, to further distinguish between the proposals.

Although the County intends to rely in part on objective measurements where possible, by submitting a proposal interested consultants acknowledge that the selection process will necessarily turn in large part on purely subjective standards.

The RFPs will be ranked based on the points noted in parentheses assigned to each item listed below. If "does not meet this requirement" is acknowledged, proposer may include an explanation as to why such requirement is not applicable. Inclusion of an explanation does not obligate the County to credit proposer for responding to the item.

1. Proposer complied with RFP technical requirements: 3 bound copies and 1 digital copy of RFP provided, cover letter, table of contents, and overview of firm. (0-5 pts)

Submittal meets this requirement: 5 does not meet this requirement: _____

Grader comment: _____

2. Proposer has the appropriate experience required as outlined in the RFP and provided sufficient evidence of that experience: General experience, list of similar projects, customer reference list, proposed contractor staff, and proposed sub-contractors. (0-25 pts)

Submittal meets this requirement: 20 does not meet this requirement: _____

Grader comment: The Proposer did not include a list of similar projects.

3. Proposer has included references. Score based on inclusion and content of references. (0-10 pts)

Submittal meets this requirement: 10 does not meet this requirement: _____

Grader comment: _____

4. **Proposer has included Section II. I. Statement of Approach referencing the Scope of Services. (0-25 pts)**

Submittal meets this requirement: 15 does not meet this requirement: _____

Grader comment: _____ The Proposer did not incorporate an in-depth plan for funding. They also did not show a clear outline of the services that they intend to provide.

5. **Cost. (0-25 pts)**

Submittal meets this requirement: 10 does not meet this requirement: _____

Grader comment: _____ The Proposer did not meet the cost outlined within the RFP. They also did not include an alternative funding mechanism that could bridge the funding gap that they highlighted.

6. **Perceived congruence of Proposer's solution with the County's needs. (0-10 pts)**

Submittal meets this requirement: _____ does not meet this requirement: X

Grader comment: _____ The Proposer's budget did not align with what was proposed. There was no clear call out for services provided. The Proposer's solution did not meet the needs of the county.

Point Total: 60 / 100

Preliminary Ranking: 2 / 2

Additional Grader Comments:
