

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

EVALUATOR NAME: ALAN MANDOL

PROPOSER NAME: NE&

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)
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	
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.	
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.	The contract is much less advantageous than existing City PPAs
Advantageous	All required contract terms are included with little, if any, modification.	
Not Advantageous	Minor alteration 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.	p. 23
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.	p. 20 - suggests that O&M involves service options + there is a separate O&M agreement
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.	
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	Interview was well presented - the glA's related to the pricing methodology (B-5 not available) - accomplished developer
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: Ann Berwick

PROPOSER NAME: Nexamp

MINIMUM CRITERIA	Has the above company met this criterion? CIRCLE YES OR NO Page #		
33. Timely submission of proposal and attendance at mandatory pre-bid meeting.	YES	NO	_____
34. DCAMM Contractor Certification of Eligibility (Energy Management Services) & Update Statement.	YES	NO	_____
35. Appendix B2: Certification of financial interest disclosure and of non-collusion.	YES	NO	_____
36. Appendix B3: Certification of compliance with state tax laws, reporting of employees and contractors And withholding and remitting of child support.	YES	NO	_____
37. 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	_____
38. Evidence of appropriate insurance.	YES	NO	_____
39. At least one ground mount project developed in Massachusetts over the last five (5) years.	YES	NO	_____
40. 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.	
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	In business 11 years. Focus on and located in MA. >25 MW municipal projects. But note that they have no experience with canopies and they haven't included storage in their proposal.
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.	Finances on its balance sheet. Unusual approach to financing—avoid SMART. But they guaranteed to protect us on PPA from going in the red. On follow-up interview, they acknowledged that their B5 rate approach to financing was not viable. But they're able to fall back on SMART.
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.	Will begin development of all sites at the same time.
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.	
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.	25 sites. But haven't done canopies in the past. No battery proposal
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	They came across as highly competent, with a lot of MA experience. Concerns are that they haven't done canopies, B5 rate issue, and didn't include batteries in bid.
Advantageous	
Not Advantageous	
Unacceptable	

Composite Rating: _____ Highly advantageous _____

Reason for Composite Rating:

_____ They scored highly advantageous on almost all parameters. _____

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: Nexamp

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 NO | App F2 |
| 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 F3 |
| 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 | I did not see this. |
| 6. Evidence of appropriate insurance. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES xx NO | App C |
| 7. At least one ground mount project developed in Massachusetts over the last five (5) years. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES xx NO | 17 in last 3 yrs |
| 8. At least one solar canopy developed in Massachusetts over the last five (5) years. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES xxx NO | 1 carport, nne in Last 3 years App E |

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.	Based on Greg's reference checks I rate them HA.
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	11 years of experience. 83 full time employees in Boston 6 in Haverhill. 5 construction supervisor licenses, 5 Master Electrician, 3 NABCEP PV certified. No subs mentioned.. Numerous projects in MA with many ground mount and roof tops. 16 projects of 25 MW for munis. Because of their limited experience with solar canopies and a fundamental error in thinking the B5 rate was still open I give them an A.
<u>Advantageous</u>	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 track record of financing many projects in MA. They are financed by the Mitsubishi Diamond Generating Corp. They have \$350 million in equity financing to fund projects on its balance sheet. 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)
Highly Advantageous	All required contract terms are included, and their language provides added benefit to the City.	Provided sample PPA. Provide a table of responses indicating that they agree with the City's terms including \$20,000 payment to city.
<u>Advantageous</u>	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.	No discussion of approach. No discussion of how to expedite projects to meet SMART schedules. Projects have completion date of March/April 2020. Mechanical completion of canopies by Dec. 30, 2019 which is later than we would like. Due to this schedule for canopies I rate them A-.
<u>Advantageous -</u>	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.	HA. Very good inspection and maintenance schedule. Very good DAS system for monitoring with web access.
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.	A+, 25 sites
<u>Advantageous +</u>	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	
<u>Advantageous</u>	
Not Advantageous	
Unacceptable	

Composite Rating: A

Reason for Composite Rating:

They have a lot of experience and success in MA. They are a local company with very good financing. They have a lack of experience with carports and made an error thinking that the B5 rate was available for net metering projects.

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: Nexamp

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"/>	NO	N/A
2. DCAMM Contractor Certification of Eligibility (Energy Management Services) & Update Statement.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	NO	Appendix F8
3. Appendix B2: Certification of financial interest disclosure and of non-collusion.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	NO	Appendix F2
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"/>	NO	Appendix F3
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. addressed on pg 11 of Operations & Maintenance Agreement	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	NO	Surety/Bonds
6. Evidence of appropriate insurance.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	NO	Appendix C
7. At least one ground mount project developed in Massachusetts over the last five (5) years. Section B: Qualifications	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	NO	Appendix E and
8. At least one solar canopy developed in Massachusetts over the last five (5) years. Section B: Qualifications	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	NO	Appendix E and

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.	HA - All references were enthusiastic and positive.
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	A – Team demonstrated deep experience in MA solar policy. However, their proposal was based on a utility rate class that was discontinued this winter which raises concerns about their ability to keep abreast of electric rate rulemaking proceedings.
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.	HA - Mitsubishi recently made a substantial investment in Nexamp which solidifies their ability to finance projects of this nature.
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.	HA – No concerns about proposed contract terms.
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.	HA - Schedule aligns with City project objectives.
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.	HA - O&M plan matches industry standards.
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.	HA – All sites were included in the proposal.
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	Aside from their well-demonstrated qualifications, the project team confidently proposed a contract based on a rate class that no longer exists which raised concerns. They later clarified their proposal in a follow-up meeting and admitted the mistake.
Advantageous	
Not Advantageous	
Unacceptable	

Composite Rating: HA

Reason for Composite Rating:

Aside from the rate class mistake this team offers the City deep expertise in solar development. They would be a front-runner in most categories except, perhaps, carport development.

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.	

