

Solar Photovoltaic Systems Site Development & Operation

Evaluation & Scoring Summary

Vendor	Professional Qualifications, Experience & Expertise	Economic Terms & Conditions	Economic Benefit to City of Aurora County	Likelihood of Mutually Successful Project	Method of Project Approach	Project Schedule	Financial Capability of Proposer	Past Performance of Similar Projects	Conceptual Site Development Plan	Sight, Sound & other Neighborly Considerations	Turnkey Contracts must demonstrably benefit City of Aurora County Economically	Specialized, Professional Quality Analytical, Engineering & Project Mgmt. Skills	Total Score 100%	Comments
Possible Points	0 - 8.33	0 - 8.33	0 - 8.33	0 - 8.33	0 - 8.33	0 - 8.33	0 - 8.33	0 - 8.33	0 - 8.33	0 - 8.33	0 - 8.33	0 - 8.33	0-100	
548 Energy	0.075	0.075	0.065	0.065	0.070	0.070	0.075	0.075	0.075	0.075	0.075	0.075	87%	Had lowest PPA cost for public works facilities. Specialize in governmental work, Have strong community engagement program with their 548 Foundation. Team members have a lot experience developing, building and running solar projects
Verde Solutions	0.070	0.050	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.075	0.075	0.075	0.075	0.050	0.075	83%	Illinois based company, has completed several large solar sites in Illinois in the past four years
General Energy	0.075	0.050	0.050	0.060	0.050	0.060	0.060	0.075	0.075	0.075	0.060	0.075	77%	Specialized in building solar fields. Currently they do not own and operate solar fields under PPA framework. Was top for Fire Department Facilities.
MARS Energy	0.075	0.060	0.083	0.060	0.060	0.060	0.070	0.075	0.075	0.075	0.080	0.075	85%	They have completed several large solar fields in area (City of Naperville, Kendall County, Fox Metro Sanitary District). MARS also uses internal employees for most of the engineering, construction and maintenance of the field. Leadership has experience in operating solar fields under long term PPA.
Windfree Solar	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0%	Never submitted response
Reviewer's Name: Progressive Energy Group														
	25%	35%	20%	20%									100%	
Outstanding	21 to 25	31 to 35	18 to 20	18 to 20									90 to 100	
Good	15 to 20	25 to 30	15 to 17	15 to 17									80 to 89	
Acceptable	10 to 14	20 to 24	13 to 15	13 to 15									70 to 79	

(SAMPLE SCORING)

Evaluation & Scoring Summary

<u>Vendor</u>	Experience, Management & Stability 15%	Management & Quality 15%	Staffing Plans & Policies 15%	Technical Strength 10%	Operation Plans & Policies 15%	Pricing 30%	Total Score 100%	<u>Notes</u>
Outstanding	14.00%	14.00%	14.00%	9.00%	14.00%	28.00%	93.00%	
Acceptable	10.00%	10.00%	11.00%	8.00%	11.00%	24.00%	74.00%	
Unacceptable	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	7.00%	9.00%	21.00%	64.00%	Previous Vendor, performance issues, did not meet contract terms.
Good	12.00%	12.00%	12.00%	9.00%	13.00%	25.00%	83.00%	

Reviewer's Name

SCORED BY:

	10%	15%	30%
Outstanding	10	14-15	28-30
Good	9	12-13	25-27
Acceptable	8	10-11	22-24
Unacceptable	7	1-9	1-21

Rating System Definitions	% Range
<p>Unacceptable: A proposal or interview response that contains major error(s), omission(s), or deficiency (ies) that demonstrates (i) a lack of understanding of the issues identified in the RFP and (ii) an approach that cannot be expected to meet or has a very high risk of not meeting the requirements and objectives of the RFP; none of these conditions can be corrected without a major rewrite or revisions of the proposal or interview response, as applicable.</p>	<p>60 to 69% "D"</p>
<p>Acceptable: A proposal or interview response that (i) satisfies all of the RFP requirements with only minimal detail to demonstrate feasibility or viability of the proposer's approach to successfully complete the project and (ii) shows only minimal understanding of the RFP objectives. There exists an overall moderate or high degree of risk of the proposer not meeting the RFP requirements or goals for the Project.</p>	<p>70 to 79% "C"</p>
<p>Good: A proposal or interview response that (i) satisfies all RFP requirements with adequate detail to demonstrate feasibility of that proposer's approach to successfully complete the project and (ii) offers some significant strengths or numerous minor strengths that are not offset by weaknesses in the understanding of the RFP objectives. There exists an overall low to moderate degree of risk of the proposer not meeting the RFP requirements and goals for the project.</p>	<p>80 to 89% "B"</p>
<p>Outstanding: A proposal or interview response that (i) satisfies all RFP requirements with extensive detail to demonstrate feasibility or viability of the proposer's approach to successfully complete the project and (ii) offers numerous significant strengths that are not offset by weaknesses in the understanding of the RFP objectives. There exists an overall low degree of risk of the proposer not meeting the RFP requirements and goals for the Project.</p>	<p>90 to 100% "A"</p>