

EVALUATION FORM RFP # 18-111 Solar PV Development for Onsite Energy Generation Phase 3

EVALUATOR NAME: Alan Mandl

PROPOSER NAME: Ameesco

MINIMUM CRITERIA

Has the above company met this criterion?
CIRCLE YES OR NO Page #

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|----|-------|
| 1. Timely submission of proposal and attendance at mandatory pre-bid meeting. | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES | NO | _____ |
| 2. DCAMM Contractor Certification of Eligibility (Energy Management Services) & Update Statement. | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES | NO | _____ |
| 3. Appendix B2: Certification of financial interest disclosure and of non-collusion. | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES | NO | _____ |
| 4. Appendix B3: Certification of compliance with state tax laws, reporting of employees and contractors And withholding and remitting of child support. | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES | NO | _____ |
| 5. Certification that the respondent, if ultimately awarded a contract, will guarantee completion of all work required within due dates or the time periods specific by the City. | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES | NO | _____ |
| 6. Evidence of appropriate insurance. | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES | NO | _____ |
| 7. At least one ground mount project developed in Massachusetts over the last five (5) years. | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES | NO | _____ |
| 8. At least one solar canopy developed in Massachusetts over the last five (5) years. | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES | NO | _____ |

Proposals that do not demonstrate compliance with the Minimum Criteria will not be further considered.

COMPARATIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation of each proposal for services as Solar PV Development of Onsite Energy Generation Phase 3 will be based upon the "Comparative Evaluation Criteria" described in this section. The following scale will be used to rate each evaluation criterion, as well as to determine a composite rating of each proposal:

"Highly Advantageous"
 "Advantageous"
 "Not Advantageous"
 "Unacceptable"

1. QUALITY OF PAST PROJECTS:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	All references were satisfied and more than one was enthusiastic.	
Advantageous	All references were satisfied.	
Not Advantageous	One or more of the references was dissatisfied.	
Unacceptable	None of the references was satisfied with the proposer or contract.	

2. PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS AND AVAILABILITY: Specialized experience is required of the proposed project personnel to undertake the work assignments. Responses must clearly demonstrate the capability, academic background, training, certifications and experience of the proposed personnel (not just of the respondent). If consultants will be employed, similar information must be provided and the portions to be consulted must be identified. (There is no penalty of use of consultants; the qualifications of the entire team will be evaluated.) Proposer's qualifications and ability will be scored using the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
<u>Highly Advantageous</u>	Significant project team experience installing PV on Massachusetts municipal property, project team experience installing PV, and a significant level of team professional training in PV system installation; 10+ years of experience, and a superior understanding of how changes to incentives and net metering offered in Massachusetts could impact the financial benefit to the City	most extensive experience installing PV on MA municipal property - proposal includes in depth understanding of impacts of changes in incentives and net metering
Advantageous	Significant project team experience installing PV on Massachusetts municipal property and a significant level of team professional training in PV system installation; 5+ years of experience, and an understanding of how incentives offered in Massachusetts could impact the financial benefit to the City. Significant experience installing solar parking canopies and some experience with storage.	
Not Advantageous	Some project team members with experience installing PV on municipal property and some professional training in PV system installations. Some experience installing solar parking canopies and storage.	

Unacceptable	No evidence of previous experience installing PV systems on municipal property and no professional training in PV system installations. No experience with solar parking canopies.	
--------------	--	--

3. FINANCING CAPABILITIES: The ability to finance the construction of the PV system is critical to the proposer's ability to complete the project. Proposers should provide in their responses a clear discussion of how they intend to finance the system and what financing partners will be involved in the project. Proposer's financing capabilities will be scored using the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
<u>Highly Advantageous</u>	Significant evidence of firm's ability to finance the PV system with extensive track record of providing financing for similar projects, and a demonstration that financing can be secured in a timely manner to meet critical project deadlines.	Proposer demonstrates extensive financing track record for similar projects
Advantageous	Significant evidence of firm's ability to finance the PV system.	
Not Advantageous	Some evidence of firm's ability to finance the PV system.	
Unacceptable	No evidence of firm's ability to finance the PV system.	

4. SAMPLE CONTRACT AND REQUIRED TERMS: On-site renewable solar generation contract negotiations can present a significant risk to the timely completion of a solar project. The Respondent's sample contract will be evaluated and ranked using the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
<u>Highly Advantageous</u>	All required contract terms are included, and their language provides added benefit to the City.	Amereco provided a contract updated with SMART language
Advantageous	All required contract terms are included with little, if any, modification.	
Not Advantageous	Minor alternation required of key contract terms that do not create additional risks for the City.	
Unacceptable	No evidence of, or unwillingness to accept, required contract terms.	

5. APPROACH AND SCHEDULE: The response shall include an explanation of how the respondent will approach the various tasks, including scheduling, methods and sources. A preliminary system design should also be provided. The respondent's Approach and Schedule will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
<u>Highly Advantageous</u>	Exceptional approach to work and timeline that provides an exemplary understanding of the project, the customer's needs and the SMART program with measures to expedite the time frame or assurances to reinforce compliance with the time line.	highly detailed preliminary project schedule which takes into account the SMART program
Advantageous	Adequate approach to work and timeline that demonstrates a reasonable understanding of the project, the customer's needs and the SMART program.	
Not Advantageous	Limited approach to work and timeline provided that does not demonstrate significant understanding of the project, the customer's needs, or the SMART program.	
Unacceptable	Approach to work and timeline not provided.	

6. OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE AND MONITORING PLAN: Responses will be evaluated on the adequacy of their operations, maintenance and monitoring plan. Responses should include information detailing who will be performing the operations, maintenance, and monitoring plan, and their experience in conducting operations, maintenance, and monitoring for solar PV systems and storage. Responses should include two portable public displays that will provide information about the PV system and its performance. The Proposer's Operations, Maintenance and Monitoring plan will be evaluated using the following criteria.

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
<u>Highly Advantageous</u>	Exceptional operations, maintenance and monitoring plan provided.	well developed O + M plan and monitoring - includes public displays
Advantageous	Adequate operations maintenance and monitoring plan provided.	
Not Advantageous	Limited operations, maintenance and monitoring plan provided.	
Unacceptable	No operations, maintenance and monitoring plan provided.	

7. SCOPE OF PROPOSAL (Number of Sites Included in Proposal): The RFP includes a list of 26. It is the preference of the City that all 26 sites be included in your proposal. However, the City is willing to review alternative proposals that do not include all 26 sites. If a Respondent chooses to submit an alternative proposal, the proposal must demonstrate, through narrative or pricing, why fewer sites will be more advantageous to the City. Respondents may also provide multiple options where one price proposal includes all 26 sites and additional pricing options include fewer sites.

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	Respondent's proposal includes an option to develop all 26 sites.	At page 43, Ameresco explains why specific sites were rejected, as permitted by
Advantageous	Respondent provides a proposal to develop 15-25 sites.	
<u>Not Advantageous</u>	Respondent provides a proposal to develop 7-14 sites.	
Unacceptable	Respondent provides a proposal for fewer than 7 sites.	

the IFB (scope of proposal). It should not be downgraded for submitting an permitted alternative proposal.

8. PROPOSER INTERVIEWS:

Ratings	Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	N/A - did not attend the Ameresco interview
Advantageous	
Not Advantageous	
Unacceptable	

Composite Rating: _____

Reason for Composite Rating:

Note: Please give an overall composite rating using "HA", "A" or "NA"

[Return completed (except for Pricing Proposal And Methodology section)
Evaluation Form to Chief Procurement Officer]

PRICING PROPOSAL AND METHODOLOGY: Respondents should provide pricing proposals for the scenarios outlined in RFP Section 6.2. Pricing proposals will be scored using the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	Significant economic benefit with performance guarantees clearly demonstrated and operation and maintenance assurances are provided.	
Advantageous	Economic benefit is clearly demonstrated and accuracies for long-run performance are provided	
Not Advantageous	Pricing does not provide adequate economic benefit or respondent does not provide substantial assurances for long-run benefit.	
Unacceptable	Proposed pricing is incomplete or does not provide economic benefit to the City.	

EVALUATION FORM RFP # 18-111 Solar PV Development for Onsite Energy Generation Phase 3

EVALUATOR NAME: William H. Ferguson William H Ferguson

PROPOSER NAME: Ameresco

MINIMUM CRITERIA	Has the above company met this criterion? CIRCLE YES OR NO	Page #
1. Timely submission of proposal and attendance at mandatory pre-bid meeting.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES xx NO	_____
2. DCAMM Contractor Certification of Eligibility (Energy Management Services) & Update Statement.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES xx NO	_____
3. Appendix B2: Certification of financial interest disclosure and of non-collusion.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES xx NO	App. I
4. Appendix B3: Certification of compliance with state tax laws, reporting of employees and contractors And withholding and remitting of child support.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES xx NO	App. I
5. Certification that the respondent, if ultimately awarded a contract, will guarantee completion of all work required within due dates or the time periods specific by the City.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES xx NO	p. 3 of letter
6. Evidence of appropriate insurance.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES xx NO	App. B
7. At least one ground mount project developed in Massachusetts over the last five (5) years.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES xx NO	p.22-23. 17 with most for munis/gov
8. At least one solar canopy developed in Massachusetts over the last five (5) years.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES xx NO	p. 22-23. 7 with most For munis/gov

Proposals that do not demonstrate compliance with the Minimum Criteria will not be further considered.

COMPARATIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation of each proposal for services as Solar PV Development of Onsite Energy Generation Phase 3 will be based upon the "Comparative Evaluation Criteria" described in this section. The following scale will be used to rate each evaluation criterion, as well as to determine a composite rating of each proposal:

"Highly Advantageous"
"Advantageous"
"Not Advantageous"
"Unacceptable"

1. QUALITY OF PAST PROJECTS:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
<u>Highly Advantageous</u>	All references were satisfied and more than one was enthusiastic.	HA based on Ann's reference checks.
Advantageous	All references were satisfied.	
Not Advantageous	One or more of the references was dissatisfied.	
Unacceptable	None of the references was satisfied with the proposer or contract.	

2. PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS AND AVAILABILITY: Specialized experience is required of the proposed project personnel to undertake the work assignments. Responses must clearly demonstrate the capability, academic background, training, certifications and experience of the proposed personnel (not just of the respondent). If consultants will be employed, similar information must be provided and the portions to be consulted must be identified. (There is no penalty of use of consultants; the qualifications of the entire team will be evaluated.) Proposer's qualifications and ability will be scored using the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
<u>Highly Advantageous</u>	Significant project team experience installing PV on Massachusetts municipal property, project team experience installing PV, and a significant level of team professional training in PV system installation; 10+ years of experience, and a superior understanding of how changes to incentives and net metering offered in Massachusetts could impact the financial benefit to the City	100 employees in Framingham, 17 years in business. 48 muni PPAs in MA. 5 MW of canopies in MA, 37 MW nationally. Experience with battery storage at 3 projects. 7 MA contractor licenses on staff, 5 licensed PEs on staff. Four key local subs on team for civil/geo tech eng., site contractor and two well experienced electrical subs. The best understanding of the SMART program and process of all firms interviewed and as shown on p. 60-61 of their proposal. For these reasons I give them an HA.
Advantageous	Significant project team experience installing PV on Massachusetts municipal property and a significant level of team professional training in PV system installation; 5+ years of experience, and an understanding of how incentives offered in Massachusetts could impact the financial benefit to the City. Significant experience installing solar parking canopies and some experience with storage.	
Not Advantageous	Some project team members with experience installing PV on municipal property and some professional training in PV system installations. Some experience installing solar parking canopies and storage.	

Unacceptable	No evidence of previous experience installing PV systems on municipal property and no professional training in PV system installations. No experience with solar parking canopies.	
--------------	--	--

3. FINANCING CAPABILITIES: The ability to finance the construction of the PV system is critical to the proposer's ability to complete the project. Proposers should provide in their responses a clear discussion of how they intend to finance the system and what financing partners will be involved in the project. Proposer's financing capabilities will be scored using the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
<u>Highly Advantageous</u>	Significant evidence of firm's ability to finance the PV system with extensive track record of providing financing for similar projects, and a demonstration that financing can be secured in a timely manner to meet critical project deadlines.	They have a well described financing capability in Section 2 of their proposal including project and construction financing. I rate them HA.
Advantageous	Significant evidence of firm's ability to finance the PV system.	
Not Advantageous	Some evidence of firm's ability to finance the PV system.	
Unacceptable	No evidence of firm's ability to finance the PV system.	

4. SAMPLE CONTRACT AND REQUIRED TERMS: On-site renewable solar generation contract negotiations can present a significant risk to the timely completion of a solar project. The Respondent's sample contract will be evaluated and ranked using the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
<u>Highly Advantageous</u>	All required contract terms are included, and their language provides added benefit to the City.	The City of Newton currently has a PPA with Ameresco. They indicate that this same contract can be used with modifications in schedules for the SMART incentive program. I rate them HA.
Advantageous	All required contract terms are included with little, if any, modification.	
Not Advantageous	Minor alternation required of key contract terms that do not create additional risks for the City.	
Unacceptable	No evidence of, or unwillingness to accept, required contract terms.	

5. APPROACH AND SCHEDULE: The response shall include an explanation of how the respondent will approach the various tasks, including scheduling, methods and sources. A preliminary system design should also be provided. The respondent's Approach and Schedule will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
<u>Highly Advantageous</u>	Exceptional approach to work and timeline that provides an exemplary understanding of the project, the customer's needs and the SMART program with measures to expedite the time frame or assurances to reinforce compliance with the time line.	On page 60 of their proposal they identify the ISA as the critical path item. To expedite the projects they plan to, "negotiate the MOU and PPA parallel with the interconnection process in order to obtain the ISAs as rapidly as possible". They have done preliminary designs and have detailed schedules for each site. They have a plan that makes the carports a priority so that they can be completed in the summer of 2019 as requested by the City. For these reason I rate them HA.
Advantageous	Adequate approach to work and timeline that demonstrates a reasonable understanding of the project, the customer's needs and the SMART program.	
Not Advantageous	Limited approach to work and timeline provided that does not demonstrate significant understanding of the project, the customer's needs, or the SMART program.	
Unacceptable	Approach to work and timeline not provided.	

6. OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE AND MONITORING PLAN: Responses will be evaluated on the adequacy of their operations, maintenance and monitoring plan. Responses should include information detailing who will be performing the operations, maintenance, and monitoring plan, and their experience in conducting operations, maintenance, and monitoring for solar PV systems and storage. Responses should include two portable public displays that will provide information about the PV system and its performance. The Proposer's Operations, Maintenance and Monitoring plan will be evaluated using the following criteria.

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
<u>Highly Advantageous</u>	Exceptional operations, maintenance and monitoring plan provided.	They have a thorough OM&V program speed out in Appendix G of their proposal. I have worked with three of their OM&V staff and they have been on top of things. I rate them HA.
Advantageous	Adequate operations maintenance and monitoring plan provided.	
Not Advantageous	Limited operations, maintenance and monitoring plan provided.	
Unacceptable	No operations, maintenance and monitoring plan provided.	

7. SCOPE OF PROPOSAL (Number of Sites Included in Proposal): The RFP includes a list of 26. It is the preference of the City that all 26 sites be included in your proposal. However, the City is willing to review alternative proposals that do not include all 26 sites. If a Respondent chooses to submit an alternative proposal, the proposal must demonstrate, through narrative or pricing, why fewer sites will be more advantageous to the City. Respondents may also provide multiple options where one price proposal includes all 26 sites and additional pricing options include fewer sites.

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	Respondent's proposal includes an option to develop all 26 sites.	They have proposed ten sites with one of them Langley which is not on the list of sites but was inadvertently included in the assessors maps. They have earned a NA.
Advantageous	Respondent provides a proposal to develop 15-25 sites.	
<u>Not Advantageous</u>	Respondent provides a proposal to develop 7-14 sites.	
Unacceptable	Respondent provides a proposal for fewer than 7 sites.	

8. PROPOSER INTERVIEWS:

Ratings	Criterion rating and reason(s)
<u>Highly Advantageous</u>	They were able to provide the most direct and succinct answers of all the proposers. Their knowledge of the SMART process as shown in this interview was the best. I give them an HA.
Advantageous	
Not Advantageous	
Unacceptable	

Composite Rating: HA _____

Reason for Composite Rating:

They rated HA in all categories except one which is the number of sites that they proposed. It would be in the City's best interest to discuss with them the possibility of doing more sites, especially canopy sites. No other proposer comes close to their experience and capability with canopies.

Note: Please give an overall composite rating using "HA", "A" or "NA"

[Return completed (except for Pricing Proposal And Methodology section)
Evaluation Form to Chief Procurement Officer]

PRICING PROPOSAL AND METHODOLOGY: Respondents should provide pricing proposals for the scenarios outlined in RFP Section 6.2. Pricing proposals will be scored using the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	Significant economic benefit with performance guarantees clearly demonstrated and operation and maintenance assurances are provided.	They are proposing block four pricing based on their detailed analysis of the queues in the SMART pipeline. No other firm has done this detailed analysis. This would decrease the financial benefit compared to using block one or two pricing which the other proposers are using.
Advantageous	Economic benefit is clearly demonstrated and accuracies for long-run performance are provided	
Not Advantageous	Pricing does not provide adequate economic benefit or respondent does not provide substantial assurances for long-run benefit.	
Unacceptable	Proposed pricing is incomplete or does not provide economic benefit to the City.	

EVALUATION FORM RFP # 18-111 Solar PV Development for Onsite Energy Generation Phase 3

EVALUATOR NAME: Ann Berwick

PROPOSER NAME: Ameresco

MINIMUM CRITERIA	Has the above company met this criterion?		Page #
	CIRCLE YES	OR NO	
1. Timely submission of proposal and attendance at mandatory pre-bid meeting.	YES	NO	_____
2. DCAMM Contractor Certification of Eligibility (Energy Management Services) & Update Statement.	YES	NO	_____
3. Appendix B2: Certification of financial interest disclosure and of non-collusion.	YES	NO	_____
4. Appendix B3: Certification of compliance with state tax laws, reporting of employees and contractors And withholding and remitting of child support.	YES	NO	_____
5. Certification that the respondent, if ultimately awarded a contract, will guarantee completion of all work required within due dates or the time periods specific by the City.	YES	NO	_____
6. Evidence of appropriate insurance.	YES	NO	_____
7. At least one ground mount project developed in Massachusetts over the last five (5) years.	YES	NO	_____
8. At least one solar canopy developed in Massachusetts over the last five (5) years.	YES	NO	_____

Proposals that do not demonstrate compliance with the Minimum Criteria will not be further considered.

COMPARATIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation of each proposal for services as Solar PV Development of Onsite Energy Generation Phase 3 will be based upon the "Comparative Evaluation Criteria" described in this section. The following scale will be used to rate each evaluation criterion, as well as to determine a composite rating of each proposal:

"Highly Advantageous"
 "Advantageous"
 "Not Advantageous"
 "Unacceptable"

1. QUALITY OF PAST PROJECTS:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	All references were satisfied and more than one was enthusiastic.	All references were enthusiastic.
Advantageous	All references were satisfied.	
Not Advantageous	One or more of the references was dissatisfied.	
Unacceptable	None of the references was satisfied with the proposer or contract.	

2. PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS AND AVAILABILITY: Specialized experience is required of the proposed project personnel to undertake the work assignments. Responses must clearly demonstrate the capability, academic background, training, certifications and experience of the proposed personnel (not just of the respondent). If consultants will be employed, similar information must be provided and the portions to be consulted must be identified. (There is no penalty of use of consultants; the qualifications of the entire team will be evaluated.) Proposer's qualifications and ability will be scored using the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	Significant project team experience installing PV on Massachusetts municipal property, project team experience installing PV, and a significant level of team professional training in PV system installation; 10+ years of experience, and a superior understanding of how changes to incentives and net metering offered in Massachusetts could impact the financial benefit to the City	Ten years of experience and well acquainted with MA laws and regulations.
Advantageous	Significant project team experience installing PV on Massachusetts municipal property and a significant level of team professional training in PV system installation; 5+ years of experience, and an understanding of how incentives offered in Massachusetts could impact the financial benefit to the City. Significant experience installing solar parking canopies and some experience with storage.	
Not Advantageous	Some project team members with experience installing PV on municipal property and some professional training in PV system installations. Some experience installing solar parking canopies and storage.	

Unacceptable	No evidence of previous experience installing PV systems on municipal property and no professional training in PV system installations. No experience with solar parking canopies.	
--------------	--	--

3. FINANCING CAPABILITIES: The ability to finance the construction of the PV system is critical to the proposer's ability to complete the project. Proposers should provide in their responses a clear discussion of how they intend to finance the system and what financing partners will be involved in the project. Proposer's financing capabilities will be scored using the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	Significant evidence of firm's ability to finance the PV system with extensive track record of providing financing for similar projects, and a demonstration that financing can be secured in a timely manner to meet critical project deadlines.	Lots of experience with financing similar projects and evidence of ability to procure financing.
Advantageous	Significant evidence of firm's ability to finance the PV system.	
Not Advantageous	Some evidence of firm's ability to finance the PV system.	
Unacceptable	No evidence of firm's ability to finance the PV system.	

4. SAMPLE CONTRACT AND REQUIRED TERMS: On-site renewable solar generation contract negotiations can present a significant risk to the timely completion of a solar project. The Respondent's sample contract will be evaluated and ranked using the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	All required contract terms are included, and their language provides added benefit to the City.	
Advantageous	All required contract terms are included with little, if any, modification.	
Not Advantageous	Minor alternation required of key contract terms that do not create additional risks for the City.	
Unacceptable	No evidence of, or unwillingness to accept, required contract terms.	

5. APPROACH AND SCHEDULE: The response shall include an explanation of how the respondent will approach the various tasks, including scheduling, methods and sources. A preliminary system design should also be provided. The respondent's Approach and Schedule will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	Exceptional approach to work and timeline that provides an exemplary understanding of the project, the customer's needs and the SMART program with measures to expedite the time frame or assurances to reinforce compliance with the time line.	Clear understanding of all of these issues.
Advantageous	Adequate approach to work and timeline that demonstrates a reasonable understanding of the project, the customer's needs and the SMART program.	
Not Advantageous	Limited approach to work and timeline provided that does not demonstrate significant understanding of the project, the customer's needs, or the SMART program.	
Unacceptable	Approach to work and timeline not provided.	

6. OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE AND MONITORING PLAN: Responses will be evaluated on the adequacy of their operations, maintenance and monitoring plan. Responses should include information detailing who will be performing the operations, maintenance, and monitoring plan, and their experience in conducting operations, maintenance, and monitoring for solar PV systems and storage. Responses should include two portable public displays that will provide information about the PV system and its performance. The Proposer's Operations, Maintenance and Monitoring plan will be evaluated using the following criteria.

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	Exceptional operations, maintenance and monitoring plan provided.	Lots of experience with operations and maintenance.
Advantageous	Adequate operations maintenance and monitoring plan provided.	
Not Advantageous	Limited operations, maintenance and monitoring plan provided.	
Unacceptable	No operations, maintenance and monitoring plan provided.	

7. SCOPE OF PROPOSAL (Number of Sites Included in Proposal): The RFP includes a list of 26. It is the preference of the City that all 26 sites be included in your proposal. However, the City is willing to review alternative proposals that do not include all 26 sites. If a Respondent chooses to submit an alternative proposal, the proposal must demonstrate, through narrative or pricing, why fewer sites will be more advantageous to the City. Respondents may also provide multiple options where one price proposal includes all 26 sites and additional pricing options include fewer sites.

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	Respondent's proposal includes an option to develop all 26 sites.	Only 9 sites proposed.
Advantageous	Respondent provides a proposal to develop 15-25 sites.	
Not Advantageous	Respondent provides a proposal to develop 7-14 sites.	
Unacceptable	Respondent provides a proposal for fewer than 7 sites.	

8. PROPOSER INTERVIEWS:

Ratings	Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	Impressive team. Experienced in Newton. Fluent in answering all questions.
Advantageous	
Not Advantageous	
Unacceptable	

Composite Rating: _____ Highly advantageous _____

Reason for Composite Rating:

I am giving them a rating of highly advantageous despite their bid on only 9 sites, in light of their otherwise high scores and the experience we've already had with them in Newton.

Note: Please give an overall composite rating using "HA", "A" or "NA"

[Return completed (except for Pricing Proposal And Methodology section)
Evaluation Form to Chief Procurement Officer]

PRICING PROPOSAL AND METHODOLOGY: Respondents should provide pricing proposals for the scenarios outlined in RFP Section 6.2. Pricing proposals will be scored using the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	Significant economic benefit with performance guarantees clearly demonstrated and operation and maintenance assurances are provided.	
Advantageous	Economic benefit is clearly demonstrated and accuracies for long-run performance are provided	
Not Advantageous	Pricing does not provide adequate economic benefit or respondent does not provide substantial assurances for long-run benefit.	
Unacceptable	Proposed pricing is incomplete or does not provide economic benefit to the City.	

EVALUATION FORM RFP # 18-111 Solar PV Development for Onsite Energy Generation Phase 3

EVALUATOR NAME: Cadmus (Chad Laurent and Gregory Hall)

PROPOSER NAME: Ameresco

MINIMUM CRITERIA	Has the above company met this criterion? CIRCLE YES OR NO		Page #
1. Timely submission of proposal and attendance at mandatory pre-bid meeting.	<input checked="" type="radio"/> YES	NO	N/A
2. DCAMM Contractor Certification of Eligibility (Energy Management Services) & Update Statement.	<input checked="" type="radio"/> YES	NO	page 1, 65 (Section 9)
3. Appendix B2: Certification of financial interest disclosure and of non-collusion.	<input checked="" type="radio"/> YES	NO	97 (Appendix I)
4. Appendix B3: Certification of compliance with state tax laws, reporting of employees and contractors And withholding and remitting of child support.	<input checked="" type="radio"/> YES	NO	96 (Appendix I)
5. Certification that the respondent, if ultimately awarded a contract, will guarantee completion of all work required within due dates or the time periods specific by the City. Section 9)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> YES	NO	65, 83 (Appendix D,
6. Evidence of appropriate insurance.	<input checked="" type="radio"/> YES	NO	79 (Appendix B)
7. At least one ground mount project developed in Massachusetts over the last five (5) years.	<input checked="" type="radio"/> YES	NO	22 (Section 3)
8. At least one solar canopy developed in Massachusetts over the last five (5) years.	<input checked="" type="radio"/> YES	NO	22 (Section 3)

Proposals that do not demonstrate compliance with the Minimum Criteria will not be further considered.

COMPARATIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation of each proposal for services as Solar PV Development of Onsite Energy Generation Phase 3 will be based upon the "Comparative Evaluation Criteria" described in this section. The following scale will be used to rate each evaluation criterion, as well as to determine a composite rating of each proposal:

"Highly Advantageous"
 "Advantageous"
 "Not Advantageous"
 "Unacceptable"

1. QUALITY OF PAST PROJECTS:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	All references were satisfied and more than one was enthusiastic.	References were very satisfied and recommended Ameresco for future work.
Advantageous	All references were satisfied.	
Not Advantageous	One or more of the references was dissatisfied.	
Unacceptable	None of the references was satisfied with the proposer or contract.	

2. PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS AND AVAILABILITY: Specialized experience is required of the proposed project personnel to undertake the work assignments. Responses must clearly demonstrate the capability, academic background, training, certifications and experience of the proposed personnel (not just of the respondent). If consultants will be employed, similar information must be provided and the portions to be consulted must be identified. (There is no penalty of use of consultants; the qualifications of the entire team will be evaluated.) Proposer's qualifications and ability will be scored using the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	Significant project team experience installing PV on Massachusetts municipal property, project team experience installing PV, and a significant level of team professional training in PV system installation; 10+ years of experience, and a superior understanding of how changes to incentives and net metering offered in Massachusetts could impact the financial benefit to the City	The project team is very experienced in developing municipal solar projects in the Commonwealth and with the City of Newton – they have developed the two previous solar phases and received very positive feedback from the City.
Advantageous	Significant project team experience installing PV on Massachusetts municipal property and a significant level of team professional training in PV system installation; 5+ years of experience, and an understanding of how incentives offered in Massachusetts could impact the financial benefit to the City. Significant experience installing solar parking canopies and some experience with storage.	
Not Advantageous	Some project team members with experience installing PV on municipal property and some professional training in PV system installations. Some experience installing solar parking canopies and storage.	

Unacceptable	No evidence of previous experience installing PV systems on municipal property and no professional training in PV system installations. No experience with solar parking canopies.	
--------------	--	--

3. FINANCING CAPABILITIES: The ability to finance the construction of the PV system is critical to the proposer's ability to complete the project. Proposers should provide in their responses a clear discussion of how they intend to finance the system and what financing partners will be involved in the project. Proposer's financing capabilities will be scored using the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	Significant evidence of firm's ability to finance the PV system with extensive track record of providing financing for similar projects, and a demonstration that financing can be secured in a timely manner to meet critical project deadlines.	In-house construction financing, established equity partners for long-term ownership finance.
Advantageous	Significant evidence of firm's ability to finance the PV system.	
Not Advantageous	Some evidence of firm's ability to finance the PV system.	
Unacceptable	No evidence of firm's ability to finance the PV system.	

4. SAMPLE CONTRACT AND REQUIRED TERMS: On-site renewable solar generation contract negotiations can present a significant risk to the timely completion of a solar project. The Respondent's sample contract will be evaluated and ranked using the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	All required contract terms are included, and their language provides added benefit to the City.	Ameresco has worked with the City in the past and plan to utilize the same PPA structure and terms (with SMART adjustments). This should result in very quick contract negotiations.
Advantageous	All required contract terms are included with little, if any, modification.	
Not Advantageous	Minor alternation required of key contract terms that do not create additional risks for the City.	
Unacceptable	No evidence of, or unwillingness to accept, required contract terms.	

5. APPROACH AND SCHEDULE: The response shall include an explanation of how the respondent will approach the various tasks, including scheduling, methods and sources. A preliminary system design should also be provided. The respondent's Approach and Schedule will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	Exceptional approach to work and timeline that provides an exemplary understanding of the project, the customer's needs and the SMART program with measures to expedite the time frame or assurances to reinforce compliance with the time line.	Ameresco is comfortable with the timeline needed to complete construction by the end of the Summer of 2019. Their assumptions about the SMART program reflect close monitoring of regulatory developments.
Advantageous	Adequate approach to work and timeline that demonstrates a reasonable understanding of the project, the customer's needs and the SMART program.	
Not Advantageous	Limited approach to work and timeline provided that does not demonstrate significant understanding of the project, the customer's needs, or the SMART program.	
Unacceptable	Approach to work and timeline not provided.	

6. OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE AND MONITORING PLAN: Responses will be evaluated on the adequacy of their operations, maintenance and monitoring plan. Responses should include information detailing who will be performing the operations, maintenance, and monitoring plan, and their experience in conducting operations, maintenance, and monitoring for solar PV systems and storage. Responses should include two portable public displays that will provide information about the PV system and its performance. The Proposer's Operations, Maintenance and Monitoring plan will be evaluated using the following criteria.

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	Exceptional operations, maintenance and monitoring plan provided.	Monitoring plan meets industry Standards and allows for responsive maintenance and field technician deployment.
Advantageous	Adequate operations maintenance and monitoring plan provided.	
Not Advantageous	Limited operations, maintenance and monitoring plan provided.	
Unacceptable	No operations, maintenance and monitoring plan provided.	

7. SCOPE OF PROPOSAL (Number of Sites Included in Proposal): The RFP includes a list of 26. It is the preference of the City that all 26 sites be included in your proposal. However, the City is willing to review alternative proposals that do not include all 26 sites. If a Respondent chooses to submit an alternative proposal, the proposal must demonstrate, through narrative or pricing, why fewer sites will be more advantageous to the City. Respondents may also provide multiple options where one price proposal includes all 26 sites and additional pricing options include fewer sites.

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	Respondent's proposal includes an option to develop all 26 sites.	Only nine sites were proposed for development, but this could reflect realistic analysis regarding what sites are feasible given the City's timeline.
Advantageous	Respondent provides a proposal to develop 15-25 sites.	
Not Advantageous	Respondent provides a proposal to develop 7-14 sites	
Unacceptable	Respondent provides a proposal for fewer than 7 sites.	

8. PROPOSER INTERVIEWS:

Ratings	Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	Ameresco is an extremely well qualified vendor who have worked with the City of Newton to develop the last two phases of solar. Their project team has the experience to deliver on a variety of project types, but their best offering is their high quality carports which have received very positive feedback from City staff and residents.
Advantageous	
Not Advantageous	
Unacceptable	

Composite Rating: HA _____

Reason for Composite Rating:

Ameresco are a proven MA-based developer with an impressive track record of constructing every project they contract to develop. In addition, Ameresco has a strong working relationship with the City, a good sense of local stakeholder concerns, and a strong grasp of the SMART program.

Note: Please give an overall composite rating using "HA", "A" or "NA"

[Return completed (except for Pricing Proposal And Methodology section)
Evaluation Form to Chief Procurement Officer]

PRICING PROPOSAL AND METHODOLOGY: Respondents should provide pricing proposals for the scenarios outlined in RFP Section 6.2. Pricing proposals will be scored using the following criteria:

Ratings		Criterion rating and reason(s)
Highly Advantageous	Significant economic benefit with performance guarantees clearly demonstrated and operation and maintenance assurances are provided.	
Advantageous	Economic benefit is clearly demonstrated and accuracies for long-run performance are provided	
Not Advantageous	Pricing does not provide adequate economic benefit or respondent does not provide substantial assurances for long-run benefit.	
Unacceptable	Proposed pricing is incomplete or does not provide economic benefit to the City.	

