

EVALUATION REPORT

Evaluation of Proposals Received on November 9, 2018 in Response to a Request for Proposals for a Developer of a Photovoltaic System to be Located on Facilities and Lands Owned Atlantic City Municipal Utilities Authority, Atlantic County, New Jersey



Prepared for:

Atlantic City Municipal Utilities Authority

By:

**The Atlantic City Municipal Utilities Authority Evaluation
Team**

Dated:

December 17, 2018

Evaluation Report

Table of Contents

Report Sections	Page
1. Overview of the RFP	5
2. Responses to the RFP	8
3. Decision Making Strategy and Proposal Evaluation Matrix	9
4. Evaluation: Financial Benefits	10
5. Evaluation: Technical Design & Approach	12
6. Evaluation: Respondent's Experience	19
7. Evaluation: Commercial Factors	23
8. Recommendation	24

Attachments

Solar Proposal Summary	Attachment 1
Proposal Ranking Evaluation Matrix	Attachment 2
Economic Analysis Summary	Attachment 3
Unforeseen Project Cost Adjustment Sensitivity Analysis	Attachment 4

Executive Summary

This Report is being provided pursuant to the requirements of the competitive contracting provisions of the Local Public Contracts Law, specifically, N.J.S.A. 40A:11-4.1(k); LFN 2008-20, dated December 3, 2008, *Contracting for Renewable Energy Services*, BPU protocol for measuring energy savings in PP A agreements (*Public Entity Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Cost Savings Guidelines*, dated February 20, 2009); LFN 2009-10, dated June 12, 2009, *Contracting for Renewable Energy Services: Update on Power Purchase Agreements*, and all other applicable law.

The purpose of the Evaluation Report is to provide the Atlantic City Municipal Utilities Authority (hereafter referred to as "Authority" or "ACMUA"), with an evaluation of proposals received for its planned solar project and to provide a recommendation to the ACMUA.

The goal of the ACMUA is to implement a solar energy project that is environmentally responsible, educational and economically beneficial to the ACMUA. To this end, on October 5, 2018, the ACMUA issued a Request for Proposals ("RFP"), as amended, for a Power Purchase Agreement ("PPA") for the purchase by the ACMUA of electricity generated by photovoltaic solar energy system ("System") implemented by a proposing firm ("Respondent") to the RFP, at its sole cost and expense (the Respondent to be awarded the project will be referred to as the "Successful Respondent"), to be located on facilities and lands owned by the Atlantic City Municipal Utilities Authority, in the County of Atlantic, New Jersey.

Pursuant to the RFP, the Successful Respondent will finance, design, permit, construct, install, operate and maintain the System, all in accordance with the terms set forth in the RFP including the terms proposed on the Successful Respondent's PPA Price Quotation Proposal Forms. The Successful Respondent will also have all ownership rights to the potential tax benefits and Solar Renewable Energy Certificates ("SRECs") generated by the Systems at each facility and will monetize the SRECs.

The RFP contained technical, site specific requirements and the results of the preliminary feasibility assessment performed by the ACMUA's energy consultant, Gabel Associates, which defined and estimated the technical potential for the System at the ACMUA's.

The RFP included one mandatory proposal option. The mandatory Option 1, as set forth in Article II of the RFP, included a ground mounted system to be developed at the ACMUA Pleasantville Water Treatment Plant.

Additionally, Respondents were permitted to provide additional, alternative proposals based on their own due diligence, feasibility assessments, and alternative strategies, as long as the Respondents included a proposal on the mandatory proposal Option 1. Under the RFP, the ACMUA retained sole discretion to select the proposal option under which the PPA, if any, will be awarded.

As set forth in the RFP, the Successful Respondent and the ACMUA will enter into a 15-year PPA under which the ACMUA will purchase all electricity produced from the System at a rate per kWh. Production will be guaranteed by the Successful Respondent. Pursuant to law, the PPA price must be lower than the delivered cost of power from the local electric utility company; i.e. Atlantic City Electric (“ACE”). This PPA structure provides the ACMUA with a reduction in its energy expenditures and minimizes the uncertainty that may result from price increases in the electricity market during the 15-year term of the PPA, in addition to other environmental and educational benefits that may be realized by the ACMUA. At the conclusion of the PPA Term, the ACMUA will have three options; the default option is for the Successful Respondent or system owner to remove the system at their cost, the ACMUA will have the option to purchase the systems at a fair market value, and, if the law allows, an option for continued or renewed PPA. These last two options are likely to result in significant long-term savings for the remaining life of the equipment.

To evaluate proposals, the ACMUA organized an evaluation team comprised of Administration personnel and supporting legal and energy professionals (collectively, “Evaluation Team”). The Evaluation Team developed the RFP and evaluation criteria, administered the procurement process (including site visits, RFP addenda, and written Q&A), determined legal completeness and technical compliance of the proposals received, conducted interviews with proposing teams, completed a detailed economic analysis, performed a collective evaluation and proposal ranking by consensus, and drafted this consensus-based Evaluation Report for consideration by the ACMUA in making an award decision. Evaluation of the proposals was based on point-ranking in a variety of categories, including considerations of risk, financial benefits, technical design and approach factors, Respondent experience, and other factors as defined in the Evaluation Matrix included in the RFP¹.

The ACMUA received proposals from six (6) solution providers (hereafter referred to as "Respondents") on November 9, 2018 in response to the RFP, including:

- HESP Solar
- Cambria Solar / ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC
- Advanced Solar Products / IGS Solar
- EZenergy/ Greenskies Renewable Energy
- Solar Landscape, Inc. / Spano Partner Holdings
- Ferreira Construction Co., Inc. / Summit Water Capital Advisors

Following a legal and preliminary economic review, all proposals were considered complete and legally compliant with the requirements of the RFP, however, the proposals submitted by Advanced Solar Products and Ferreira Construction were withdrawn. As such, the Evaluation Team completed interviews of all four remaining (4) Respondents.

The Evaluation Team would like to thank all the Respondents for their time and effort in proposing their alternate options, however, the Evaluation Team chose to only evaluate Option 1 proposals.

¹ In accordance with the Competitive Contracting requirements of the Local Public Contracts Law, the Evaluation Matrix was developed and published prior to the receipt of proposals in response to the RFP.

The Evaluation Team conducted a detailed technical and economic analysis, experience review, formal ranking of the proposals as per the evaluation criteria published in the RFP, and development of this Evaluation Report.

The Evaluation Team developed a consensus ranking of each proposal within each evaluation category, leading to an overall score for each proposal between 0 and 100. The proposal with the highest score represents the strongest weighted-balance of all factors considered. Based on information contained within the proposals, and additional information collected during the oral interviews, the Evaluation Team scored the four (4) proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria specified in the RFP. Table 1 below summarizes the scores for each of the proposals:

Table 1: Evaluation of Proposals

Respondent	Option	PPA Rate (\$/kWh)	Annual Escalation Rate	Score
HESP Solar	1	\$0.0300	1.5%	79
Cambria Solar & ACMUA Solar Partners	1	\$0.0450	1.5%	68
Spano Partners Holding & Solar Landscape	1	\$0.0487	1.5%	80
EZEnergy & Greenskies Energy	1	\$0.0780	0.0%	46

Economic merit, particularly regarding savings through reduced utility bill payments, was evaluated in detail for each proposal. All proposals under the mandatory Option 1 provide savings, measured as the difference between the solar PPA rate and what it would cost to purchase the same electricity from the utility.

The solar market in New Jersey is transitioning from the solar incentive through the SREC Registration Program to an unknown successor program. The Clean Energy Act passed in May 2018 requires that the Board of Public Utilities (BPU) closes the SREC Registration Program upon the attainment of 5.1% of all electricity sold in the State coming from solar projects or by June 1, 2021. The solar market is concerned that, depending on how the math is done, attainment of 5.1% could be as soon as a few weeks away. Therefore, the risk that the proposed projects would not be able to be built with out the support of the SREC Registration Program is significant and a determining factor in the evaluation of the proposals.

The strongest ranked proposal under mandatory Option 1 and the only proposal that included assurances that with or without the current SREC incentive program the project would be built is the proposal from Spano Partners Holding and Solar Landscape, provides a 15-year net present value (NPV) of savings of approximately of \$318,849.

The Evaluation Team finds that the proposals deliver meaningful savings for the ACMUA, are competitive with current market practice, and deliver other significant benefits. Based on an evaluation of price and other factors, the Evaluation Team recommends awarding the PPA to the highest ranked Respondent under Option 1.

1. Overview of the RFP

On October 5, 2018, ACMUA issued an RFP for a PPA for electricity generated by the System to be financed, designed, installed, owned, operated and maintained by the Successful Respondent at the ACMUA. The ACMUA sought proposals for a mandatory "Option 1" as set forth in Article II of the RFP, which included ground-mounted systems to be developed at the ACMUA. Additionally, Respondents were permitted to provide additional, alternative proposals based on their own due diligence, feasibility assessments, and alternative strategies, as long as the Respondents included a proposal on the mandatory proposal Option 1.

The Successful Respondent and the ACMUA will enter into a PPA for 15 years, the maximum duration permitted by State law, under which ACMUA will purchase the electricity produced from the System at a fixed rate per kWh. The PPA rate must be less than the local utility electric tariff in the initial year of the term for the project to be awarded. It is anticipated that the Successful Respondent will finance the project through a combination of revenues derived from the sale to the ACMUA of the electrical output of the System, the sale of Solar Renewable Energy Certificates ("SRECs") in the competitive SREC market, federal tax benefits (i.e. both investment tax credits and accelerated depreciation) and investor capital. At the end of the PPA term, the ACMUA will have the three options; (a) have the System removed at the Successful Respondent's expense; or (b) renegotiation of an extension of the PPA, if allowable by law; or (c) purchase the System by the ACMUA at fair market value ("FMV").

Proposals were to be evaluated on the basis of price and non-price criteria, in accordance with competitive contracting provisions of the Local Public Contracts Law, specifically, N.J.S.A. 40A:11-4.1(k); LFN 2008-20, dated December 3, 2008, *Contracting for Renewable Energy Services*, BPU protocol for measuring energy savings in PPA agreements (*Public Entity Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Cost Savings Guidelines*, dated February 20, 2009); LFN 2009-10, dated June 12, 2009, *Contracting for Renewable Energy Services: Update on Power Purchase Agreements*, and all other applicable law.. Components of the RFP are as follows:

a) Solar Systems Size

A preliminary feasibility assessment was performed by the ACMUA's energy consultant, Gabel Associates, to identify the technical potential for a solar system at the ACMUA. Based upon this conservative, preliminary assessment, the System was estimated to have a total capacity of approximately 520 kW DC depending on the areas included and design approach. The preliminary system size was capped at 80% previous 12 months of electricity usage of the associated electric account. The RFP required that all proposals not exceed this 80% of the Baseline Annual Usage cap.

The Respondents were provided with twelve (12) months of electric usage data and utility tariff information for the facilities included. The RFP also included a conceptual layout designating the areas available for the installation of solar array based on discussion with the ACMUA and its professionals.

b) Pricing and Other Commercial Requirements

The RFP required the Respondents to propose with system sizes, production guarantees, a PPA Price, and an annual escalation rate, if any, for every proposal submitted. In addition, all Respondents were required to provide a price adjustment factor to account for any increase in project development cost and unforeseen utility imposed electrical interconnection costs. These adjustment factors provide a controlled way for unforeseen cost changes to be handled after award, if required.

Proposals were required to include the following information about each Respondent:

- Proposal Option 1 - PPA Price Quotation Sheets
- Respondent Information/Cover Letter
- Consent of Surety
- Form of Construction Performance Bond
- Agreement for Proposal Security in Lieu of Proposal Bond
- Proposal Bond
- Ownership Disclosure Statement
- Non-Collusion Affidavit
- Consent to Investigation
- Statement of Respondent's Qualifications
- Acknowledgement of Receipt of Addenda
- Affirmative Action Compliance Notice/Mandatory EEO Language
- Disclosure of Investment Activities in Iran
- Proposal Checklist
- Political Contribution Form C. 271
- Public Works Contractor Certificate (*N.J.S.A 34:11 56.51*)
- Notice of Classification (*RFP Section 4.14*)
- Total Amount of Uncompleted Contracts Form DPMC701 (*RFP Section 4.14*)
- Business Registration Certificate (*RFP Section 4.12*)

The RFP also contained specific standard terms that were to be included in the PPA agreement, as well as standard requirements for proposal and construction bonding, insurance, etc.

c) Technical Requirements

The RFP provided technical requirements as well as special site conditions as a preliminary guide for the Respondents' proposed System. These Exhibits were used as the minimum requirements to satisfy the RFP.

Prior to the release of the RFP, the ACMUA's energy consultant, Gabel Associates, reviewed the information public available from local electric distribution company, Atlantic City Electric (ACE), about interconnection and the distribution circuits. Gabel Associates did ascertain from the ACE Restricted Circuit Map that the project may be restricted to 250 kW. This information was included in the RFP for all Respondents to consider in their design. This is a preliminary finding

and not definitive; the only way to determine whether a solar project can be interconnected is to file an interconnection application once detailed designs are prepared.

d) Evaluation Process

To evaluate proposals, the Authority organized an evaluation team comprised of: Bruce G. Ward, Executive Director, Ryan J. Scerbo, Esq., of DeCotiis, Fitzpatrick, Cole & Giblin, Andrew Conte and Brian Bizjak of Gabel Associates (collectively, “Evaluation Team”). The Evaluation Team developed the RFP, administered the procurement process (including site visits, RFP addenda, and written Q&A), determined legal completeness and technical compliance of the proposals received, conducted oral interviews with proposing teams, completed a detailed evaluation and proposal ranking, and drafted this consensus Evaluation Report for consideration by the Authority in making an award decision.

The following milestones summarize the RFP development and evaluation process:

- 10/5/18 – RFP Issued
- 10/19/18 – Pre-proposal Conference and Site Tours
- 10/15/18 – Formal Written Addenda No. 1
- 10/29/18 – Formal Written Addenda No. 2 & Q&A Issued
- 11/6/18 – Formal Written Addenda No. 3 & Q&A Issued
- 11/9/18 – Proposals Received
- 11/28/18 – Oral Interviews with Compliant Respondents
- 12/5/18 – Meeting of Evaluation Team to Rank Proposals
- 12/17/18 – Evaluation Report Issued

2. Responses to the RFP

Although the ACMUA received six (6) proposals, two (2) withdrew from the process, so only four (4) compliant proposals were evaluated in response to the RFP as outlined in Table 2. The proposals submitted by Advanced Solar Products and Ferreria Construction were withdrawn and therefore were not evaluated. Each Respondent consisted of a team made up of, at a minimum, a project developer (typically the PPA Provider) and an Engineering, Procurement and Construction ("EPC") company. Under this structure, the PPA Provider is responsible for the financing, design, permitting, acquisition, construction, installation, operation and maintenance of the Systems. To accomplish this task, the PPA Provider will contract with an EPC to complete the required engineering and construction work. The Evaluation Team would like to thank all the Respondents for their time and effort in proposing their alternate options, however, the Evaluation Team chose to evaluate only Option 1.

Table 2: Overview of Respondent Teams

PPA Provider	EPC
HESP Solar (HESP)	HESP Construction (HESP)
ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC	Cambria Solar
Greenskies Renewable Energy	EZnergy
Spano Partners Holdings (Spano)	Solar Landscape, LLC.

The proposals provided all the necessary documentation as required of Respondents by the RFP. Table 3 provides an overview of the proposals that were submitted to the ACMUA.

Table 3: Overview of Received Proposals

Respondent	Option	Total Size (kW DC)	PPA Rate (\$/kWh)	Annual Escalation Rate
HESP Solar	1	527.10	\$0.03000	1.5%
Cambria	1	557.308	\$0.04500	1.5%
Solar Landscape	1	514.08	\$0.04870	1.5%
EZnergy	1	560.56	\$0.07800	0.0%

Attachment 1 is a detailed summary of the key information from the proposal submitted by each responsive proposing team.

3. Decision Making Strategy and Proposal Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation of the proposals was based on point-ranking in a variety of categories, including financial benefits, technical design factors, Respondent experience, commercial factors, and educational materials. The full Evaluation Team developed a consensus ranking of each proposal within each evaluation category, leading to an overall score for each proposal between 0 and 100. The proposal with the highest score represents the strongest weighted-balance of all factors considered.

Economic merit, as determined by projected net savings realized by the project, was a factor in the evaluation. As allowed by Competitive Contracting law, it is not the only factor considered in the evaluation. Other considerations, such as risk, design merit, and experience, as well as educational value, are also part of the evaluation. The strongest ranked proposal is based on a combination of relative economic strength along with these other factors.

The Evaluation Matrix used for proposal ranking, which was also included in the RFP, is as follows:

CATEGORY	EVALUATION FACTOR	WEIGHTING
Financial Benefits	NPV of Benefits	50
Technical Design & Approach	Design Strategy	10
	O&M Plan and Approach	5
	Project Management Approach	6
Respondent's Experience	Contractor Experience	10
	Project Experience	8
	Financial Capability	3
Commercial Factors	PPA Adjustment Factors	4
	Commercial Term in PPA	4
Total Proposal		100

The Evaluation Matrix scorings for each proposal are provided in **Attachment 2**. The following sections of this Evaluation Report provide a review of the evaluation criteria for each Respondent and its associated proposal.

4. Evaluation: Financial Benefits

The Authority realizes economic benefits from the installation of a solar project through the energy costs savings generated by purchasing electricity from the solar project through a PPA at a cost lower than the cost of electricity that would otherwise be delivered by and/or purchased from the local electric utility (otherwise referred to as ‘grid-sourced’ electricity).

To calculate the estimated energy cost savings for the Authority, Gabel Associates prepared a forecast of delivery rates under the local utility tariff rate for Atlantic City Electric (“ACE”) and added the forecasted electricity supply costs. Supply costs were evaluated based on both forecasted third-party supplier rates and Basic Generation Service rates (“BGS” or default service). The forecasted total electricity costs calculated as if the ACMUA continued the current purchasing strategy over the next fifteen (15) years was compared to the total electricity costs calculated if the ACMUA were to move ahead with the solar project inclusive of the PPA rates proposed by each Respondent and the reduced, remaining utility & third-party supplier electricity purchases.

Gabel Associates’ forecasts of the local utility delivery tariff rates and the cost of grid-sourced power is the result of a detailed analysis of the delivery tariff and the market costs for power supply, by component, over the term of the PPA. The ACMUA currently purchases electricity through a third-party supplier, and the economic analysis has included the current contract costs as well as forecasted third-party supplier costs over the term. This detailed analysis takes into account the following factors:

1. The components of the utility delivery tariff rate that are not avoided as a result of the solar installation. For example, the customer charge and the major portion of the demand charges are not avoided through the purchase of solar energy generated by the System.
2. The components of grid-sourced power supply costs that are only partially avoided by a solar installation; for example, peak capacity and transmission obligations.
3. The most recent energy market fundamentals (i.e., New York Mercantile Exchange (“NYMEX”) futures, Energy Information Administration (“EIA”) long term escalation rates, and environmental and Renewable Portfolio Standard (“RPS”) programs such as the SREC program) are incorporated to provide the best indication of future energy market prices.
4. The expiration date of the current third-party supplier contract and future third-party supply rate trends. Third party supply rates after the expiration of the current contract were calculated as a discount from BGS rates to conservatively estimate the potential savings from a third-party supplier contract (as compared to BGS). The third-party supply rate discount in our analysis reflects an expectation of a diminishing disparity between the two rates over time.
5. The impact of future energy costs as a result of national, state, and regional environmental initiatives.
6. The impact that general energy market escalations will have upon long-term energy prices.
7. The most recent SREC market forecasted prices.

All Proposal Options were evaluated based on the Net Present Value (“NPV”) of the total savings over the PPA term, which is a widely adopted methodology that recognizes the time value of money and the opportunity cost of money, to the ACMUA. To calculate the NPV benefits provided

by each proposal, Gabel Associates utilized the Respondent's proposed guaranteed ninety percent (90%) of estimated solar production during the term of the PPA multiplied by the per-kwh savings (difference between the solar PPA rate and the average cost of grid-sourced power avoided by on-site solar generation – otherwise referred to as the 'solar price-to-compare'). All savings in future years are discounted back to present value using a 5% discount rate, consistent with standard accounting practices for NPV calculations. Note that NPV is a function not just of the first year PPA rate and the annual escalator, but also of the size of the System and the fraction of the utility purchase displaced by solar generation.

Gabel Associates' economic evaluation, based on the sources and factors listed above, utilized current utility tariff prices and current energy market conditions and applied assumed annual escalation rates for different portions of the distribution tariff and grid-sourced power supply components, in order to compare each of the PPA pricing proposals to electricity costs under a 'non-solar' electricity price scenario. All proposals were benchmarked against the same 'non-solar' electricity price scenario. In preparation of the forecast of the future prices for grid-sourced electricity, the annual escalation rates applied to the various cost components range conservatively from a low of 0.0% (flat) to as high as 3.0%. The economic evaluation considered first and second-year and annual nominal (non-discounted) savings, as well as the NPV of total savings over the full 15-year term. Please see Attachment 3 for a summary of the economic analysis results.

It is important to note that there are certain charges in the ACMUA's electricity utility tariffs that will not be impacted in the first year but will be in the second year of operation. This mostly relates to capacity, transmission, and other demand-based charges that are set based on the maximum measurement from the previous 12-months. As such it takes 12-months for the reduction from the installed solar project to impact the electricity bills. This is difference between the first and second year savings is shown in Attachment 3.

ACMUA currently purchase electricity from a third-party supplier. The current third-party supplier agreement will expire prior to the start of operation. ACMUA intends to enter into another supplier agreement for another 12 months, during which the solar project will be designed, permitted, constructed, and commissioned to start operation. The savings calculated from the economic analysis was determined based on the most likely scenario: a comparison of forecasted BGS supply costs for the remaining electricity purchased by the ACMUA after the installation of solar to forecasted third party supply costs for electricity (calculated as discount from forecasted BGS supply rates), if the ACMUA continued the current purchasing strategy without solar.

The Evaluation Matrix contains 50 points for Financial Benefits, which are awarded proportionally based on 15-year NPV of the solar price compare analysis of the proposed system sizes and guaranteed production values. The proposal with the highest NPV is awarded the full 50 points for economic merit, and the remaining projects are awarded points in proportion to their savings NPV relative to the best proposal in the group.

Of the four (4) proposal submissions the ACMUA received for the mandatory Option 1, HESP had the highest NPV and was awarded 50 points. Cambria Solar had the second best NPV with 38 points, followed by Spano Partners Holding with 35 points, and EZnergy with 17 points.

5. Evaluation: Technical Design & Approach

The Evaluation Team would like to thank all the Respondents for their time and effort in proposing the alternate options, however, the Evaluation Team has chosen to evaluate only the mandatory Option 1.

The evaluation of the technical design/approach has several criteria including:

- Design Strategy
- O&M Plan and Approach
- Project Management Approach

Each of these areas will be discussed, reviewed, and rated for each of the respondents' proposals.

a) Design Strategy

The design strategy in each of the proposals were evaluated based on reviewing the preliminary system layout, sizing, production, and interconnection method as well as the major system components. The following section provides an explanation of the review of the solar system layout, sizing, production, and interconnection method. This section also includes a table for each respondent along with an overview of the System components that are utilized in each respondent's preliminary solar design and each component's compliance with the technical specifications in the RFP contained in Appendix B and C.

Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC:

The Evaluation Team compared the total system size for Option 1 of 557.30 kW DC. Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC's proposed system layouts were compared to the conceptual site plan layouts that were provided as part of the RFP and were found to be compliant.

The Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC's proposed Option 1 total system has a guaranteed output of 666,810 kWh, which in all proposed options represents 90% of the expected total system output. Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC used HelioScope for their production estimates, below is a summary of the estimated production in their proposal.

Proposal Option	Total System Size: (kW DC)	Expected Total System Output: (kWh)	Guaranteed Total System Output: (kWh)
Option 1	557.30	740,900	666,810

Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC's proposed equipment from the proposal and compliance to specifications are as follows:

Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC: Major System Components

System Component	Manufacturer	Compliance with Project Technical Specifications
PV Modules	Heliene – 360 Watts	Yes
Inverters	SMA – String Inverter	Yes
Racking System	RBI – Ground Mount Ballasted	Yes
DAS	Also Energy	Yes

Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC confirmed the use of Tier 1 materials, either those listed above or equivalent.

The Evaluation Team concluded that Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC provided design strategies for that did not fully consider the loss of area provide and the shading to the array due to the silo which will be constructed. Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC equipment selection were in compliance with the RFP. Cambria Solar proposed a ballasted array because of the possible remnants form the basin which was located in the area prior. Cambria Solar’s interconnection strategy is to connect to at the utility meter as a line side connection. For these reasons the Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC team was awarded eight (8) points out of the ten (10) points for this category.

EZnergy/Greenskies:

The Evaluation Team compared the total system size for Option 1 of 560.56 kW DC. EZnergy/Greenskies proposed systems were compared with the conceptual site plan layout that was provided as part of the RFP. The layouts proposed by EZnergy/Greenskies did not allow for the installation of the silo that was noted in the RFP.

The EZnergy/Greenskies’ proposed Option 1 has a guaranteed output of 667,393 kWh, which represents 90% of the expected total system output. EZnergy/Greenskies used PVwatts for their production estimates, below is a summary of the estimated production in their proposal.

Proposal Option	Total System Size: (kW DC)	Expected Total System Output: (kWh)	Guaranteed Total System Output: (kWh)
Option 1	560.56	741,548	667,393

EZnergy/Greenskies’ proposed equipment from the proposal and compliance to specifications are as follows:

EZnergy/Greenskies: Major System Components

System Component	Manufacturer	Compliance with Project Technical Specifications
PV Modules	Q-Cells – 385W	Yes

Inverters	Chint – String Inverter	Yes
Racking System	Unirac Racking or GenMounts Racking – Driven Post	Yes
DAS	Locus	Yes

EZnergy/Greenskies confirmed the use of Tier 1 materials, either those listed above or equivalent.

The Evaluation Team concluded that EZnergy/Greenskies’s provided design strategies that did not fully consider the loss of area provide and the shading to the array due to the silo which will be constructed. EZnergy/Greenskies’s equipment selection were in compliance with the RFP. While EZnergy presented a design that shows modules and inverters above the potential high water plane, and EZnergy presented information from FEMA about flooding in coastal AE zones, the new FEMA rules for increasing heights to above the potential high water plane apply to primary structures within floodplains not to accessory structures. As such the Evaluation Team concluded the proposed design approach was non-mandatory. EZnergy’s interconnection strategy is to connect to at the utility meter as a line side connection. For these reasons the EZnergy/Greenskies team was awarded four (4) points out of the ten (10) points for this category.

HESP Solar:

The Evaluation Team compared the total system size for Option 1 of 527.10 kW DC. HESP Solar’s proposed systems were compared with the conceptual site plan layout that was provided as part of the RFP and were found to be compliant.

The HESP’s proposed Option 1 system has a guaranteed output of 666,992 kWh, which represents 90% of the expected total system output. HESP Solar provided the PVWatts calculations for the systems substantiating the production calculations, below is a summary of the estimated production in their proposal.

Proposal Option	Total System Size (kW DC)	Expected Total System Output (kWh)	Guaranteed Total System Output (kWh)
Option 1	527.10	741,103	666,992

HESP Solar's proposed equipment from the proposal and compliance to specifications are as follows:

HESP Solar: Major System Components

System Component	Manufacturer	Compliance with Project Technical Specifications
PV Modules	Trina Solar – TSM-DE14(II) STD MONO – 350W	Yes
Inverters	Yaskawa-Solectria – PVI – String Inverters	Yes

Racking System	Patriot Solar Group – Atlas-1 – Driven Post or Ballasted	Yes
DAS	Locus Energy	Yes

HESP Solar confirmed the use of Tier 1 materials, either those listed above or equivalent.

The Evaluation Team concluded that HESP’s provided design strategies did not fully consider the loss of area provide and the shading to the array due to the silo which will be constructed. HESP Solar equipment selection was found to be compliance with the RFP. HESP’s interconnection strategy is to connect to ACMUA’s distribution panel as a load side connection behind ACMUA’s transformer and, if necessary, they would consider a line side connection. During their interview HESP’s responses about the technical aspects of the project left the impression with the Evaluation Team that HESP is uncertain of their exact design choices. For these reasons HESP Solar was awarded five (5) points out of the ten (10) points for this category.

Solar Landscape/Spano Partners:

The Evaluation Team compared the total system size for Option 1 of 514.08 kW DC. Solar Landscape/Spano Partners proposed systems were compared with the conceptual site plan layout that was provided as part of the RFP. The layouts proposed by Solar Landscape/Spano Partners did not allow for the installation of the silo that was noted in the RFP.

The Solar Landscape/Spano Partners’ proposed Option 1 system has a guaranteed output of 673,520 kWh, which represents 90% of the expected total system output. Solar Landscape/Spano Partners provided the HelioScope and PVWatts calculations for the Systems substantiating the production calculations, below is a summary of the estimated production in their proposal.

Proposal Option	Total System Size (kW DC)	Expected Total System Output (kWh)	Guaranteed Total System Output (kWh)
Option 1	514.08	748,355	673,520

Solar Landscape/Spano Partners’ proposed equipment from the proposal and compliance to specifications are as follows:

Solar Landscape/Spano Partners: Major System Components

System Component	Manufacturer	Compliance with Project Technical Specifications
PV Modules	Heliene – 72P Series – 340W	Yes
Inverters	SMA – Sunny Highpower Peak3 – Inverters	Yes
Racking System	RBI – Ground Mount System – Driven Post or Ballasted	Yes
DAS	Solar Log	Yes

Solar Landscape/Spano Partners confirmed the use of Tier 1 materials, either those listed above or equivalent.

The Evaluation Team concluded that Solar Landscape/Spano Partners provided design strategies that did not fully consider the loss of area provide and the shading to the array due to the silo which will be constructed. Solar Landscape/Spano Partners' equipment selection were in compliance with the RFP. Solar Landscape/Spano Partners design included a reverse power relay which would limit the power back to the grid to keep the output to the grid under the limit set by ACE for this circuit. The Evaluation Team recognizes this design element as integral in enabling a larger system to be built without violating the potential ACE restriction. For these reasons the Solar Landscape/Green Street team was awarded nine (9) points out of the ten (10) points for this category.

b) Operations and Maintenance Plan and Approach

Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC:

The Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC team indicated that Cambria Solar will provide operations and maintenance service for ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC. Maintenance response time for normal calls is within 24 hours and emergency maintenance response is within 5 minutes because their offices are that close. Cambria Solar indicated they would perform monthly site visits and an annual service inspection of the system. Cambria Solar indicated they would be cutting the grass inside the array approximately every 3 weeks during the growing season. In comparison to the other Respondents, the Evaluation Team awarded Cambria Solar's proposal team five (5) points out of the possible five (5) points for this category.

EZnergy/Greenskies:

The EZnergy/Greenskies team indicated that EZnergy will be performing the operation and maintenance for this project for the craftsmanship warrantee period of five (5) years. Greenskies indicated they have their own inhouse operations and maintenance people who will backup EZnergy during the craftsmanship warrantee period. They will decide after the craftsmanship warrantee ends to either bring this inhouse or have a different company of the same caliber provide the operation and maintenance. They indicated that normal response times would be within 24 hours while the response time for emergency calls would be within 4 hours. EZnergy anticipates a minimum of two site inspections per year. EZnergy indicated they would be cutting the grass inside the array 1 – 2 times per month during the growing season. In comparison to the other Respondents, the Evaluation Team awarded EZnergy/Greenskies two (2) points out of the five (5) points for this category.

HESP Solar:

HESP indicated they will initially be self-performing the operation and maintenance for this project, however, they indicated the possibility of having a different company of the same caliber provide the operation and maintenance. They indicated that normal response times would be

within 24 hours while the response time for emergency calls would be within 4 hours. They will be placing cameras, pointing at the array, to monitor the physical condition of the array and also determine when the grass needs to be cut. HESP anticipates two site inspections per year. In comparison to the other Respondents, the Evaluation Team awarded HESP two (2) points out of the five (5) points for this category.

Solar Landscape/Spano Partners:

The Solar Landscape/Spano Partners team indicated that Solar Landscape would be performing the initial operations and maintenance for this project. Spano Partners indicated they prefer to have the installer provide the operation and maintenance during the craftsmanship warrantee period of five (5) years, however, Spano Partners did indicate that in the future they may have a different company of the same caliber provide the operation and maintenance. They indicated that normal response times would be in within 24 hours while the response time for emergency calls could be as short as 2 hours due to their proximity to the site. Solar Landscape indicated they will be performing four (4) site inspections per year, where two of the site inspections will result in a full commissioning report. In comparison to the other Respondents, the Evaluation Team awarded Solar Landscape/Spano Partners five (5) points out of the five (5) points for this category.

c) Project Management Approach

Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC:

The Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC team has indicated that Cambria Solar will be providing the project management services for this project via one project manager. Cambria Solar has experience with completing projects in a timely manner and maintaining project schedules. Cambria Solar stated that the project manager for this project has been involved since the development of the proposal and will remain involved through the completion of construction. Cambria Solar will schedule weekly meetings. In comparison to the other Respondents, the Evaluation Team awarded the Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC team three (3) out of the six (6) possible points for the category.

EZnergy/Greenskies:

EZnergy indicated they will be providing the project management services for this project. EZnergy has verifiable experience with completing projects in a timely manner and maintaining project schedules. EZnergy indicated they will have project manager responsible for ensuring the successful completion of the project as well as an on-site foreman during construction. EZnergy will schedule weekly construction update meetings and will provide staging plans prior to the start of construction. In comparison to the other Respondents, the Evaluation Team awarded the EZnergy/Greenskies team four (4) out of the six (6) possible points for the category.

HESP Solar:

HESP indicated that they will be providing the project management services for this project. HESP has verifiable experience with completing projects. HESP will have a project manager who will be responsible for the successful completion of the project. HESP indicated they would participate in a conference calls during construction to review the project's status. In comparison to the other Respondents, the Evaluation Team awarded the HESP solar team three (3) out of the possible six (6) points for the category.

Solar Landscape/Spano Partners:

Solar Landscape as well as Spano Partners indicated they would be involved in performing the project management services for this project. Solar Landscape indicated they would have a project manager who would be the single point of contact for Solar Landscape during the project. Solar Landscape also indicated that during construction there would be an onsite electrical foreman as well as an onsite mechanical foreman overseeing the construction effort. Spano Partners indicated they will also have a project manager assigned to the project. Solar Landscape will have weekly construction update meetings and will provide staging plans prior to the start of construction. Due to the proposed multi-layer approach, and in comparison to the other proposals received, the Solar Landscape/Spano Partners team was awarded six (6) out of the six (6) possible points for the category.

6. Evaluation: Respondent's Experience

Each Respondent was evaluated on experience, which includes the following:

- Contractor Expertise
- Project Experience
- Financial Capability

Each of these areas will be discussed, reviewed, and rated for each of the respondents' proposals.

a) Contractor Expertise

The Contractor Experience category focuses specifically on the project team's EPC firm and its likely subcontractors, and their experience with solar work in New Jersey.

Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC:

The Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC team will be using Cambria Solar for the construction portion of this project. Cambria Solar has completed several public solar project installations in the state of New Jersey. Cambria Solar completed projects include:

- Buena Municipal Utilities Authority, Buena, NJ
- Lakewood Municipal Utilities Authority, Lakewood, NJ
- Pleasantville Public Schools Solar Farm, Egg Harbor, NJ
- Lower Cape May Regional High School, Erma, NJ
- Lower Township Municipal Utilities Authority, Villas, NJ

Therefore, the Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC team was awarded six (6) out of the ten (10) points for this category.

EZnergy/Greenskies:

EZnergy/Greenskies will be using EZnergy as the EPC. EZnergy has completed a multitude of projects in New Jersey (not listed below). EZnergy projects include:

- Readington School District, Readington, NJ (3 Schools)
- Newark Public Schools, Newark, NJ (2 Schools)
- Willingboro Township, Willingboro, NJ (6 Schools)
- Tenafly School District, Tenafly, NJ (3 Schools)

Therefore, the EZnergy/Greenskies team was awarded eight (8) out of the ten (10) points for this category.

HESP:

HESP Solar indicated that HESP Construction will be the EPC firm for this project. HESP Construction is a recently created company that provides EPC services solely to HESP Solar.

- South Brunswick School District, South Brunswick, NJ (14 Schools)
- Stafford School District, Stafford, NJ (5 Schools)
- Jackson Landfill, Jackson NJ
- Tenafly School District, Tenafly, NJ (3 Schools)
- Plumsted School District, New Egypt, NJ (2 Schools)
- Manchester & Haledon School Districts, Haledon, NJ (2 Schools)

HESP Construction, due to the time it has been in the market, completed less projects than HESP Solar, but is currently in construction on a number of projects listed above. Therefore, HESP Solar was awarded eight (8) out of the ten (10) points for this category.

Solar Landscape/Spano Partners:

The Solar Landscape/Spano Partners team indicated that Solar Landscape will be acting as the EPC firm for this project. Solar Landscapes has completed several large scale projects outside of New Jersey and have only completed private projects in the state of New Jersey. The following is a partial list of Solar Landscape's projects:

- Nourison, Saddle Brook, NJ
- General Plumbing, Greenbrook, NJ
- Perfect Finishing, Clifton, NJ
- Permadur, Hillsborough Township, NJ
- RPM Warehouses, Edison, NJ

Solar Landscape has not completed a project for a public entity in New Jersey. Therefore, the Solar Landscape/Spano Partners team was awarded seven (7) out of the ten (10) points for this category.

b) Project Expertise

The Project Expertise category focuses on the assembled teams experience in developing, procuring and installing solar.

Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC:

While each of the members of ACUMA Solar Partners, LLC and Cambria Solar have developed, constructed, and operated public solar projects in the state of New Jersey as well as solar projects in other states. The Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC team has not developed, constructed, or operated a public solar project in the state of New Jersey. One (1) of the Three (3)

partners of ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC has completed several private and public solar projects in the State of New Jersey using Cambria Solar as the EPC. Below are some of the completed projects:

- Cambria Commerce Center, Pleasantville, NJ
- West Cape May Elementary School, Cape May, NJ
- Erma Volunteer Fire Company, Cape May, NJ
- Atlantic City Jitney Association, Egg Harbor Township, NJ

Cambria Solar/ACMUA Solar Partners, LLC was awarded four (4) points out of the eight (8) points for this category.

EZnergy/Greenskies:

EZnergy has experience with developing, constructing, and operating public solar projects in the state of New Jersey as well as solar projects in other states. Greenskies, as the PPA provider, has experience with developing, constructing, and operating many private solar projects, along with one (1) public sector project, in the state of New Jersey as well as solar projects in other states. EZnergy has completed several public solar installations in New Jersey, a partial list of each of EZnergy's completed projects was included in the proposal. The EZnergy/Greenskies team has never entered into a PPA for a public entity in the state of New Jersey.

EZnergy's projects include:

- Readington Board of Education, Readington, NJ (3 Schools)
- Newark Public Schools, Newark, NJ (2 Schools)
- Willingboro Township, Willingboro, NJ (6 Sites)
- Tenafly School District, Tenafly, NJ (3 Schools)

Greenskies' projects include:

- Northern Highlands Regional High School, Allendale, NJ
- Target – 28 sites in NJ
- Walmart – 7 sites in NJ

EZnergy/Greenskies was awarded seven (7) points out of the eight (8) points for this category.

HESP Solar:

HESP Solar has experience with developing, constructing, and operating public solar projects in the state of New Jersey as well as solar projects in other states. HESP Solar has completed several installations in New Jersey, an extensive list of their completed projects was included in their Proposal. HESP Solar projects include:

- South Brunswick School District, South Brunswick, NJ (14 Schools)
- Stafford School District, Stafford, NJ (5 Schools)

-
- Jackson Landfill, Jackson NJ
 - Tenafly School District, Tenafly, NJ (3 Schools)
 - Plumsted School District, New Egypt, NJ (2 Schools)

HESP has significant experience but in comparison to the other Respondents, HESP was not the most experienced. HESP was awarded seven (7) points out of the eight (8) points for this category.

Solar Landscape/Spano Partners:

Spano Partners, as the PPA provider, has experience with developing, constructing, and operating numerous public solar projects in the state of New Jersey. Solar Landscape's experience has been with private sector projects both in the state of New Jersey and other states. The Solar Landscape/Spano Partners team has never entered into a PPA for a public entity in the state of New Jersey.

Solar Landscape's projects include:

- Nourison, Saddle Brook, NJ
- General Plumbing, Greenbrook, NJ
- Perfect Finishing, Clifton, NJ
- Permadur, Hillsborough Township, NJ
- RPM Warehouses, Edison, NJ

Spano Partners' projects include:

- Plainfield School District, Plainfield, NJ (7 Schools)
- Evesham Township School District, Evesham, NJ (4 Schools)
- North Park Solar, Millstone Township, NJ
- Florence, Florence Township, NJ

Solar Landscape/Spano Partners was awarded seven (7) points out of the eight (8) points for this category.

c) Financial Capability

The Financial Capability category focuses specifically on whether the Respondent provided enough information (audited financials, bank letters, etc.) for the Evaluation Team to determine whether the proposing team is financially capable of building the project. While all Respondents provided enough information to determine the financial capability of the proposing team and were deemed capable, based on interview responses, the risk that the project would be stalled, stopped or cancelled due to the loss of State solar incentives is high with three of the four Respondents. This risk was seen by the Evaluation Team as a potential fatal flaw of the proposals that could not agree to maintain their proposed PPA rates or even complete the project without incentives. Spano Partners Holding is the only Respondent that indicated that no matter what happened to State solar incentives, they would build the project at the proposed PPA rates. Therefore, Spano Partners Holding and Solar Landscape received the full three (3) points in this category and the other Respondents received zero (0) points in this category.

7. Evaluation: Commercial Factors

Each Respondent was evaluated on the following commercial factors:

- PPA Adjustment Factors
- Requested PPA changes

Each of these areas will be discussed, reviewed, and rated for each of the Respondents' proposals.

a) PPA Adjustment Factors

Each of the Respondents were asked to indicate on the Proposal Quotation Form included in the RFP adjustment factors for unforeseen project costs that are imposed by the local utility during the interconnection process. All four (4) of the Respondents proposed adjustment factors that were acceptable to the Evaluation Team. All four (4) received the full four (4) points in this category.

b) Commercial Term in PPA

Each of the Respondents were asked to indicate on the Proposal Quotation Form included in the RFP whether their proposal would require material changes to the Form PPA provided in Appendix A-1 of the RFP. All four (4) Respondents indicated that their proposals do not require any material changes to the Form PPA or that they agreed to include the minimum terms and conditions contained in Exhibit A-1 in their respective PPA.

Three (3) of the four (4) Respondents indicated that their proposal were dependent on SRECs. As such these proposed were viewed as contingent upon the existing of a health State incentive. The State passed the new Clean Energy Act in May 2018 and in it requires the closure of the SREC Registration Program and the current SREC market. Due to these impending changes and the contingency on incentives to develop the project, the Respondents that stated their proposals were dependent on SRECs were awarded zero (0) points in this category.

Solar Landscape and Spano Partners Holding indicated that their proposal was not dependent on the value of SRECs or the existence of the current SREC market. As such Solar Landscape/Spano were awarded the maximum four (4) points in this category.

8. Recommendation

The RFP process attracted a competitive range of proposals. Following a legal and technical review, four (4) proposals were determined to be complete and legally and technically compliant with the requirements of the RFP.

The economic analysis indicates that the solar project will provide significant savings to the ACMUA, compared with continuing the current purchase strategy for electricity over the 15-year term. If the ACMUA decides to purchase the system at the end of the term (based on a fair market value determination), there will likely be strong economic value for the remaining operating life of the equipment (estimated to be an additional 10 years or more). The relatively predictable price of solar electricity also provides a hedge against future price increases of utility supply. Based on these economic considerations, the Evaluation Team believes that the implementation of a solar project would be beneficial for the ACMUA. All proposals under the mandatory Option 1 provide a savings.

In addition to economics, there will be other benefits to the ACMUA, including reduced carbon footprint and a unique asset for community engagement.

The risk that the project would be stalled, stopped, or canceled due to impending and anticipated changes to the State's solar incentive program, the SREC Registration Program, was a major focus and consideration of the Evaluation Team. The Evaluation Team valued the proposal without dependence on the current solar incentive program as most likely to be built and financed. Therefore, the strongest ranked proposal under mandatory Option 1 is the Solar Landscape/Spano Partners Holding proposal and it provides savings of approximately \$29,149 in the first year, and an approximate 15-year net present value (NPV) of savings of \$318,849.

The Evaluation Team finds that the received proposals deliver meaningful savings for the ACMUA, are competitive with current market practice, and deliver other benefits that are significant. All compliant proposals were ranked by the Evaluation Team, based on consideration of price and other factors. Based on the Evaluation Team's conclusions and the points allocated as described in the previous sections of this report, the proposal under Option 1 from Solar Landscape and Spano Partners received the highest score and provides the most benefit with the least risk to the ACMUA. The Evaluation Team recommends awarding the PPA to the highest ranked Respondent under the ACMUA's preferred proposal option.

**Attachment 1
Solar Proposal Summary**

ACMUA Solar PPA RFP Proposal Opening Results 11/9/18								
Repondent	Option	PPA Rate (\$/kWh)	Escalation Rate	System Size (KW)	Expected Output (kWh)	Unforeseen Costs Adjustment Factor (\$/kWh)		Project Development Costs Adjustment Factor (\$/kWh)
HESP Solar	1	\$ 0.0300	1.5%	527.10	741,103	\$50,000-\$99,999.99	\$0.0002	\$0.0001
						\$100,000-\$149,999.99	\$0.0004	
						\$150,000 and above	\$0.0006	
Cambria	1	\$ 0.0450	1.5%	557.30	740,900	\$50,000-\$99,999.99	\$0.01000	\$0.0000
						\$100,000-\$149,999.99	\$0.01500	
						\$150,000 and above	\$0.02000	
Solar Landscape	1	\$ 0.0487	1.5%	514.08	748,355	\$50,000-\$99,999.99	\$0.02000	\$0.0020
						\$100,000-\$149,999.99	\$0.03000	
						\$150,000 and above	\$0.02000	
Eznergy	1	\$ 0.0780	0.0%	560.56	741,548	\$50,000-\$99,999.99	\$0.00110	\$0.0020
						\$100,000-\$149,999.99	\$0.01700	
						\$150,000 and above	\$0.01700	

Attachment 2
Proposal Ranking Evaluation Matrix

CATEGORY	EVALUATION FACTOR	WEIGHTING	Option 1			
			Cambria	EZ/GS	HESP	SL/SPH
Financial Benefits	NPV of Benefits	50	38	17	50	35
Technical Design / Approach	Design Strategy	10	8	4	5	9
	O&M Plan and Approach	5	5	2	2	5
	Project Management Approach	6	3	4	3	6
Respondent's Experience	Contractor Experience	10	6	8	8	7
	Project Experience	8	4	7	7	7
	Financial Capability	3	0	0	0	3
Commercial Factors	PPA Adjustment Factors	4	4	4	4	4
	Commercial Term in PPA	4	0	0	0	4
Total Proposal		100	68	46	79	80

Attachment 3
Economic Analysis

Option 1

	PPA Rate (\$/kWh)	Escalation Rate	System Size (KW)	Guaranteed Production (kWh)	Year 1 Savings	Year 2 Savings	15 Year Savings	15 Year NPV
HESP-1	\$0.0300	1.50%	527.10	666,993	\$41,524	\$42,228	\$665,457	\$456,045
Cambia-1	\$0.0450	1.50%	557.30	666,810	\$31,619	\$32,392	\$508,657	\$348,459
Solar Landscape - 1	\$0.0487	1.50%	514.08	673,520	\$29,149	\$29,668	\$465,390	\$318,849
Ezenergy - 1	\$0.0780	0.00%	560.56	667,393	\$9,621	\$10,971	\$238,426	\$156,119

Attachment 4 Unforeseen Project Cost Adjustment Sensitivity Analysis

Respondent	Option	System Size (DC)	Escalation	Adj. Factor- Unforeseen Costs	PPA Rate	Year 1 Savings	15 Year Savings	15 Year NPV
HESP Solar	1	527.10	1.50%	\$50,000-\$99,999.99	\$0.030200	\$41,391	\$663,311	\$454,573
				\$0.000200				
				\$100,000-\$149,999.99	\$0.030400	\$41,257	\$661,165	\$453,102
				\$0.000400				
\$150,000 and above	\$0.030600	\$41,124	\$659,018	\$451,630				
Cambria	1	557.30	1.50%	\$50,000-\$99,999.99	\$0.055000	\$24,951	\$401,379	\$274,885
				\$0.010000				
				\$100,000-\$149,999.99	\$0.060000	\$21,617	\$347,739	\$238,099
				\$0.015000				
\$150,000 and above	\$0.065000	\$18,283	\$294,100	\$201,312				
Solar Landscape	1	514.08	1.50%	\$50,000-\$99,999.99	\$0.068700	\$15,679	\$248,675	\$170,221
				\$0.020000				
				\$100,000-\$149,999.99	\$0.078700	\$8,943	\$140,317	\$95,907
				\$0.030000				
\$150,000 and above	\$0.068700	\$15,679	\$248,675	\$170,221				
Ezenergy	1	560.65	0.00%	\$50,000-\$99,999.99	\$0.079100	\$8,886	\$227,791	\$148,726
				\$0.001100				
				\$100,000-\$149,999.99	\$0.095000	(\$1,725)	\$74,070	\$41,873
				\$0.017000				
\$150,000 and above	\$0.095000	(\$1,725)	\$74,070	\$41,873				
				\$0.017000				