

# **EVALUATION REPORT**

**Evaluation of Proposals Received on September 17, 2024 in  
Response to a Request for Proposal  
for a Developer of a Photovoltaic System  
on Facilities Owned by  
Roxbury Public Schools Board of Education**



**Prepared for:  
Roxbury Public Schools Board of Education**

**By:  
The Roxbury Public Schools Board of Education Evaluation Team**

**Dated:  
October 11, 2024**

---

---

# Evaluation Report

## Table of Contents

<b>Report Sections</b>	<b>Page</b>
Executive Summary .....	2
1. Overview of the RFP .....	6
2. Responses to the RFP .....	9
3. Decision Making Strategy and Proposal Evaluation Criteria.....	11
4. Evaluation: Economic Benefit.....	12
5. Evaluation: Design and Approach.....	16
b. Technical Approach and Construction Management .....	20
6. Evaluation: Respondent Experience & Capability .....	23
7. Evaluation: Educational Value .....	26
8. Recommendation.....	27

### **Attachments**

---

<b>Solar Proposal Summary</b>	<b>Attachment 1</b>
<b>Proposal Ranking Evaluation Matrix</b>	<b>Attachment 2</b>
<b>Economic Analysis Summary</b>	<b>Attachment 3</b>

---

---

## Executive Summary

This Report is being provided pursuant to the requirements of the competitive contracting provisions of the Public School Contracts Law, specifically, N.J.S.A. 18A:18A-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.

The purpose of the Evaluation Report is to provide the Roxbury Public Schools Board of Education (hereafter referred to as “BOE”), with an evaluation of proposals received for its planned solar project and to provide a recommendation to the BOE.

The goal of the BOE is to implement a solar energy project that is environmentally responsible, educational, and economically beneficial to the BOE. To this end, on August 9, 2024, the BOE issued a Request for Proposals (“RFP”), as amended, for a Power Purchase Agreement (“PPA”) for the purchase by the BOE of electricity generated by photovoltaic solar energy systems (“Systems”) 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 owned by the Roxbury Public Schools Board of Education, in the County of Morris, 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 Federal tax benefits and State solar incentives, Solar Renewable Energy Certificates - IIs (“SREC-IIs”), generated by the Systems at each facility.

The RFP contained technical, site-specific requirements and the results of the preliminary feasibility assessment performed by the BOE’s energy consultant, Gabel Associates, which defined and estimated the technical potential for the System. The RFP required respondents to perform their own assessment of technical potential and sizing of the Systems. Respondents were also encouraged to include educational and curriculum-based content as part of the proposed solution.

The BOE sought proposals for a mandatory “Option 1” as set forth in Article II of the RFP, which included ballasted, roof-mounted, and carport canopy mounted systems to be developed at Eisenhower Middle School, Roxbury High School, Franklin Elementary School, Jefferson Elementary School, Kennedy Elementary School, Lincoln Roosevelt School, and Nixon Elementary School. The BOE allowed, but did not require, Respondents to submit alternative proposal options. Under the RFP, the BOE retained sole discretion whether to consider these alternatives and to select the proposal option under which the PPA, if any, will be awarded.

All respondents included the mandatory “Option 1” in their proposal submissions. Two offered no alternatives. One respondent included one alternative “Option 2”. One responded proposed two

---

---

alternative proposal. These two alternatives did not include the carport canopies desired by the BOE and attempted to make use of roof areas that were not included due to age. Per the RFP the Evaluation Team has the ability to determine which if any alternative proposal to evaluate. Therefore, the Evaluation Team removed from the consideration any alternatives that did not include carport canopies at the High School & Eisenhower or were infeasible given the current roof conditions.

As set forth in the RFP, the Successful Respondent and the BOE will enter into a 15-year PPA under which the BOE 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. Jersey Central Power & Light (“JCP&L”). This PPA structure provides the BOE 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 BOE. At the conclusion of the PPA Term, the BOE will have three options; the default option is for the Successful Respondent or system owner to remove the system at their cost, the BOE 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 may result in potentially significant long-term savings for the remaining life of the equipment.

To evaluate proposals, the BOE organized an Evaluation Team comprised of Administration personnel (Joseph Mondanaro, Kathy Kolbusch, and Peter Riffel) and supporting energy professionals (Andrew Conte and Silvia Cuevas from Gabel Associates), 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 BOE in making an award decision. Evaluation of the proposals was based on point-ranking in a variety of categories, including financial benefits, technical design and approach factors, Respondent experience, and other factors as defined in the Evaluation Matrix included in the RFP<sup>1</sup>.

The BOE received four (4) proposals. The Evaluation Team performed an evaluation of the (4) proposals, compliant solution providers (hereafter referred to as "Respondents") for proposals received on September 17, 2024 in response to the RFP, including:

- Advanced Solar Products (ASP)
- HESP Solar (HESP)
- Solar Landscape (Solar Landscape)
- SunLight General Capital (SunLight General)

Following a legal and preliminary economic review, four proposals were considered complete and legally compliant with the requirements of the RFP. The Evaluation Team completed interviews

---

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

---

of all four (4) qualified Respondents. 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. The overall highest ranked proposal is the Advanced Solar Product's Option 2 (Alternative Option) with 97 points and provides a 15-year net present value (NPV) of savings of approximately \$3,292,332.

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

Based on the Evaluation Team's conclusions and the points allocated as described in the sections of this report, Advanced Solar Product's Option 2 (Alternative Option) received the highest score and provides the strongest overall proposal with the most overall benefit and the least overall risk to the BOE. The Evaluation Team recommends awarding the PPA to the highest ranked Respondent, Advanced Solar Product.

The table that follows includes the scores for each of the proposals.

**Table: Summary of Evaluation of Proposals**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Solar Capacity (kW)</b>	<b>PPA Rate (\$/kWh)</b>	<b>Escalation Rate</b>	<b>Points</b>
ASP (Option 1)	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	2,202	\$0.078	0.00%	96.6
	Roosevelt School	314			
	Franklin School	331			
	Kennedy School	244			
	Jefferson School	218			
	Nixon School	270			
ASP (Option 2)	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	2,202	\$0.067	0.00%	97.0
	Roosevelt School	N/A			
	Franklin School	331			
	Kennedy School	244			
	Jefferson School	218			
	Nixon School	270			
HESP Solar	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	3,023	\$0.099	2.00%	83.9
	Roosevelt School	348			
	Franklin School	363			
	Kennedy School	247			
	Jefferson School	227			
	Nixon School	280			
Solar Landscape	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	3,300	\$0.125	2.00%	63.1
	Roosevelt School	384			
	Franklin School	360			
	Kennedy School	256			
	Jefferson School	239			
	Nixon School	303			
Sunlight General	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	2,754	\$0.099	2.00%	76.8
	Roosevelt School	276			
	Franklin School	296			
	Kennedy School	315			
	Jefferson School	273			
	Nixon School	300			

---

## 1. Overview of the RFP

On August 9, 2024, the BOE 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 on the Roxbury Public Schools' facilities. The BOE sought proposals for a mandatory "Option 1" as set forth in Article II of the RFP, which included ballasted, roof-mounted, and carport canopy mounted photovoltaic solar renewable energy systems located on the roofs of Eisenhower Middle School, Roxbury High School, Franklin Elementary School, Jefferson Elementary School, Kennedy Elementary School, Lincoln Roosevelt School, and Nixon Elementary School. The BOE also allowed, but did not require, Respondents to submit alternative proposals.

The Successful Respondent and the BOE will enter into a PPA for fifteen (15) years, the maximum duration permitted by State law, under which the BOE will purchase the electricity produced from the System at the proposed rate per kWh with any proposed annual escalator. By law for the BOE to award a PPA, the PPA rate must be less than the local utility electric tariff in the initial year of the term. It is anticipated that the Successful Respondent will finance the project through a combination of revenues derived from the sale of the electrical output of the System to the BOE, the generation and sale of Solar Renewable Energy Certificates - IIs ("SREC - IIs") to the SREC Administrator through the Solar Renewable Incentive Program, federal tax benefits (i.e. both investment tax credits and depreciation) and investor capital. At the end of the PPA term, the BOE will have the three options; (a) removal of the Systems at the PPA Provider's expense; or (b) if allowable by law, extend the PPA; or (c) purchase the System by the BOE 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 Public School Contracts Law, specifically, N.J.S.A. 18A:18A-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 BOE's energy consultant, Gabel Associates, to identify the technical potential for a solar system at the BOE. Based upon this preliminary assessment, the available space for the Systems was estimated to have a total capacity of approximately 4.1 MW DC for the six facilities combined. Depending on the roof areas included and design approach, the proposed System sizes were expected to vary from Respondent to Respondent. The preliminary system size was capped at 90% of the facility's previous 12 months of On-Peak electricity usage. The RFP required that all proposals not exceed this 90% of the Baseline On-Peak 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 conceptual layout designated the

---

---

areas of the roofs and parking lots that are available for the installation of solar arrays based on discussion with the BOE and its professionals.

### **b) Pricing and Other Commercial Requirements**

The RFP required the Respondents to propose 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 costs and unforeseen electrical interconnection or structural improvement 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 PPA Price Quotation Sheets
- Respondent Information/Cover Letter
- Consent of Surety
- 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 and Belarus
- Political Contributions
- Public Works Certificate
- Notice of Classification
- Total Amount of Uncompleted Contracts
- Business Registration Certificate

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. One of these minimum requirements is to design a system and installation that maintains the roof warranties for the schools.

Prior to the release of the RFP, the BOE's energy consultant, Gabel Associates, reviewed the available hosting capacity map from the local electric distribution company, Jersey Central Power & Light (JCP&L), to inquire about interconnection difficulty. Currently the BOE does not have a



---

---

reason to anticipate a difficult interconnection. 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 BOE organized an evaluation team comprised of BOE Administration personnel (Joseph Mondanaro, Kathy Kolbusch, and Peter Riffel) and supporting energy professionals (Andrew Conte, CEM and Silvia Cuevas from 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 by consensus, and drafted this Evaluation Report for consideration by the BOE in making an award decision.

The following milestones summarize the RFP development and evaluation process:

- 8/9/2024 – RFP Issued
- 8/16/2024 – Pre-proposal Conference and Site Tours
- 8/26/2024 – Addendum No. 1 Issued
- 9/5/2024 – Addendum No. 2 Issued
- 9/17/2024 – Proposals Received
- 10/2/2024– Oral Interviews with Compliant Respondents
- 10/8/2024 – Meeting of Evaluation Team to Rank Proposals
- 10/11/2024 – Evaluation Report Issued
- 10/14/2024 – Meeting with the BOE

---

---

## 2. Responses to the RFP

The BOE received four (4) proposals and fully evaluated four (4) compliant proposals in response to the RFP as outlined in Table 2. 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 proposals that provided all the necessary documentation as required of Respondents by the RFP were evaluated. Proposals that were missing required documentation or information detailed in the RFP were rejected.

**Table: Overview of Respondent Teams**

PPA Provider	EPC	Status
Distributed Solar Development, LLC	Advanced Solar Products*	Evaluated
HESP Solar*	HESP Solar*	Evaluated
Solar Landscape *	Solar Landscape*	Evaluated
SunLight General Capital*	SunLight General Capital*	Evaluated

\* - Proposing Firms

In this report, Advanced Solar Products and Distributed Solar Development, LLC will be referred to as ASP, HESP Solar will be referred to as HESP, Solar Landscape will be referred to as Solar Landscape, and SunLight General Capital will be referred to as SunLight General.

Two respondents, HESP and SunLight General Capital included only the mandatory "Option 1" in its proposal submission, no alternatives. One respondent, ASP, included the mandatory "Option 1" as well as one alternative "Option 2". The alternative "Option 2" includes the arrays proposed in ASP Option 1 except for the canopy system at the Lincoln Roosevelt Middle School. The last respondent, Solar Landscape, included the mandatory "Option 1" in its proposal submission with two alternative options.

Solar Landscape's alternative "Option 2" does not include any canopies, and instead utilizes the rooftop of Roxbury High School. Solar Landscape's alternative "Option 3" does not include any carport canopies and does not utilize the rooftop of Roxbury High School. Option 3 offers the district the ability to consider a smaller on-site system located only on the rooftops designated in the RFP. The Evaluation Team considered all bidders mandatory options and ASP's alternative option, and did not consider Solar Landscape's two alternative proposal options due to the inability to use the High School roof and lack of carport canopies at the High School.

The following Table provides an overview of the proposals that were accepted and evaluated by the BOE.

**Table: Overview of Received Proposals**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Solar Capacity (kW)</b>	<b>PPA Rate (\$/kWh)</b>	<b>Escalation Rate</b>
ASP (Option 1)	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	2202	\$0.078	0.00%
	Roosevelt School	314		
	Franklin School	331		
	Kennedy School	244		
	Jefferson School	218		
	Nixon School	270		
ASP (Option 2)	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	2202	\$0.067	0.00%
	Roosevelt School	0		
	Franklin School	331		
	Kennedy School	244		
	Jefferson School	218		
	Nixon School	270		
HESP Solar	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	3023	\$0.099	2.00%
	Roosevelt School	348		
	Franklin School	363		
	Kennedy School	247		
	Jefferson School	227		
	Nixon School	280		
Solar Landscape (Option 1)	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	3,300	\$0.125	2.00%
	Roosevelt School	384		
	Franklin School	360		
	Kennedy School	256		
	Jefferson School	239		
	Nixon School	303		
Sunlight General	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	2,754	\$0.099	2.00%
	Roosevelt School	276		
	Franklin School	296		
	Kennedy School	315		
	Jefferson School	273		
	Nixon School	300		

**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 Criteria

Evaluation of the proposals was based on point ranking in a variety of categories, including economic benefits, design strategy, technical proposal, construction management, experience and financial capability, and educational value. 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 dominant 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 Criteria and Matrix used for proposal ranking, which was also included in the RFP, is as follows:

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>EVALUATION FACTOR</b>	<b>WEIGHTING</b>
<b>Financial Benefits</b>	<b>NPV of Benefits</b>	35
<b>Design &amp; Approach</b>	<b>Solar Design Strategy &amp; Innovative Benefits</b>	15
	<b>Technical Approach &amp; Construction Management</b>	18
<b>Respondent's Experience &amp; Capability</b>	<b>Proposal Team Experience</b>	15
	<b>Financial Capability</b>	14
<b>Educational Value</b>	<b>Educational Materials</b>	3
<b>Total Proposal</b>		<b>100</b>

The Evaluation Criteria scoring for each proposal Option 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: Economic Benefit

The BOE 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 BOE, Gabel Associates prepared a forecast of delivery rates under the local utility tariff rate for Jersey Central Power & Light (“JCP&L”) and added the forecasted electricity supply costs. Supply costs were evaluated based on both forecasted third-party supplier (TPS) rates and Basic Generation Service rates (“BGS” or default service). The forecasted total electricity costs calculated as if the BOE continued the current purchasing strategy (JCP&L and TPS) over the next fifteen (15) years was compared to the total electricity costs calculated if the BOE were to move ahead with the solar project inclusive of the PPA rates proposed by each Respondent and the reduced, remaining utility distribution and supply 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 BOE currently purchases electricity through a third-party supplier cooperative pricing system, 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-II 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-II market forecasted prices.

Gabel Associates is forecasting an increase in energy prices in 2025-2026 due to the results of the PJM Capacity auction for 2025-2026. PJM is a regional transmission organization (RTO) that

---

---

manages the movement of wholesale electricity in New Jersey and several other states in the eastern region. The recent PJM capacity auction for 2025-2026 resulted in a price increase of nearly 600% compared to the previous year. Gabel Associates predicts that this will impact JCP&L electricity prices in the coming year 2025-2026, causing a 27% increase in the BGS-Energy charge for schools under the GS Tariffs, and a 219% increase in the BGS-Capacity charge from JCP&L, one of the components of the JCP&L rate structure for schools under the GP Tariffs. The forecasted increase in energy prices has been incorporated into Gabel's economic model, resulting in an increase in potential savings since the BOE would be buying electricity from the solar project rather than the utility and would not be affected as much by the forecasted increase in energy 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 BOE. 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, forecasted TPS rates, and current energy market conditions to which assumed annual escalation rates for different portions of the distribution tariff and grid-sourced power supply components were applied, 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 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 approximately 219%. 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 BOE'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 the reason for the increase in savings from the first-year to second-year savings.

Once the solar project is in service, it may be prudent to review the BOE's contract for the third-party supply for these electric accounts and consider a transition back to default supply (known as BGS). While the cost benefit analysis suggests that this would be the best course of action for the BOE to maximize savings from net metering, the final decision can be made as the project nears commercial 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 BOE after the installation of solar to forecasted third party supply costs for electricity (calculated as discount from forecasted BGS supply rates), if the BOE continued the current purchasing strategy without solar.

The New Jersey solar incentive and solar market transitioned from the legacy SREC Registration Program (SRP) to a Transitional Incentive Program (TIP), and has now become a more permanent Successor Solar Incentive Program (SuSI) that provides Solar Renewable Energy Credits version 2.0 (SREC-II) through an Administratively Determined Incentive (ADI) pathway. The SuSI ADI program offers a fixed SREC-II value for the 15 year SREC qualification life of any solar project installed behind the meter through net metering. This securitized SREC-II is used by the respondents to buy-down the cost of the PPA to the BOE.

The Evaluation Criteria contains thirty-five (35) points for Economic Benefit, which are awarded proportionally based on the 15-year NPV of the savings derived from the solar price compare analysis of the proposed system sizes and guaranteed production values. The proposal with the highest NPV is awarded the full 35 points for economic merit, and the remaining projects are awarded points in proportion to their NPV of savings relative to the highest ranked proposal in the group.

Of the proposal evaluated by the BOE, ASP's Option 2 had the highest NPV and was awarded thirty-five points (35 points) out of the thirty-five points (35 points) available. ASP's Option 1 had the next highest NPV and was awarded thirty-four and six tenth points (34.6 points) out of the thirty-five points (35 points) available. HESP's Option 1 was awarded twenty and nine tenth points (20.9 points) out of the thirty-five points (35 points) available. Solar Landscape's Option 1 had the least NPV and was awarded four and one tenth points (4.1 points) out of the thirty-five points (35 points) available. SunLight General's Option 1 was awarded twenty-one and eight tenth (21.8 points) out of the thirty-five points (35 points) available.

Attachment 3 contains a table listing the results of the economic analysis which is also summarized in the table below.

Respondent	School	Estimated 15-Year NPV Savings	Total 15-Year NPV of Savings	Points
ASP (Option 1)	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	\$1,855,689	\$3,256,592	34.6
	Roosevelt School	\$322,895		
	Franklin School	\$340,760		
	Kennedy School	\$243,214		
	Jefferson School	\$219,170		
	Nixon School	\$274,864		
ASP (Option 2)	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	\$2,098,309	\$3,292,332	35.0
	Roosevelt School	N/A		
	Franklin School	\$377,428		
	Kennedy School	\$269,499		
	Jefferson School	\$242,660		
	Nixon School	\$304,436		
HESP Solar	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	\$992,810	\$1,967,601	20.9
	Roosevelt School	\$229,062		
	Franklin School	\$242,608		
	Kennedy School	\$163,326		
	Jefferson School	\$152,691		
	Nixon School	\$187,104		
Solar Landscape (Option 1)	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	(\$191,630)	\$384,541	4.1
	Roosevelt School	\$135,697		
	Franklin School	\$139,213		
	Kennedy School	\$97,201		
	Jefferson School	\$91,758		
	Nixon School	\$112,302		
Sunlight General	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	\$1,053,446	\$2,053,672	21.8
	Roosevelt School	\$189,747		
	Franklin School	\$211,303		
	Kennedy School	\$205,254		
	Jefferson School	\$185,704		
	Nixon School	\$208,219		



---

---

## 5. Evaluation: Design and Approach

The evaluation of the Design and Approach section carries a total of thirty-three points (33 points) weighting in the evaluation. There are two subsections to this section:

- Solar Design Strategy and Innovative Benefits – fifteen points (15 points)
- Technical Approach and Construction Management – eighteen points (18 points)

Each of these areas will be discussed and reviewed with a rating to be given for the Respondent’s Proposal.

### a. Design Strategy and Innovative Benefits

The evaluation of the Design Strategy and Innovative Benefits carries a fifteen points (15 points) weighting in the evaluation.

Each of the Respondents were evaluated on awareness of potential problems, system size, system production as indicated, design choices, proposed system components, along with any innovative benefits provided as part of their proposal.

#### Advanced Solar Products

Advanced Solar Products (ASP) proposed equipment from the proposal and compliance to specifications are as follows:

**Advanced Solar Products: Major System Components**

<b>System Component</b>	<b>Manufacturer</b>	<b>Compliance with Project Technical Specifications</b>
<b>PV Modules</b>	SEG Solar Yukon 545W	Yes
<b>Inverters</b>	Chint – 1000VDC & 1500 VDC String Inverters	Yes
<b>Rapid Shutdown</b>	If required by code, ASP will meet with code requirements	Yes
<b>Racking System</b>	DCE Eco-Top HD	Yes
<b>Mounting System</b>	M Bar Construction Carports	Yes
<b>DAS</b>	AlsoEnergy	Yes

ASP confirmed the use of Tier 1 materials, either those listed above or equivalent. ASP’s equipment selection complied with the RFP.

The Evaluation Team evaluated Option 1 of a total system size of 3,579.56 kW DC and alternative proposal “Option 2” of a total system size of 3,265.64 kW DC. ASP Option 1 includes solar arrays at all schools included in the RFP including carport canopies at the High School, Eisenhower, and Lincoln Roosevelt, as well as roof arrays on all schools except the High School and Lincoln Roosevelt. ASP Option 2 includes the arrays proposed in the Option 1 with the exception of the canopy system at the Lincoln Roosevelt Middle School. ASP’s proposed system layouts were

compared to the conceptual site plan layouts which were provided as part of the RFP and found to be compliant.

ASP Option 1 has a guaranteed total system output of 3,651,863.4 kWh which represents ninety percent (90%) of the expected total system output as guaranteed output. ASP Option 2 has a guaranteed total system output of 3,328,085.7 kWh which represents ninety percent (90%) of the expected total system output as guaranteed output. By removing this PV system from the portfolio, due to its costly small size and canopy configuration, ASP found they were able to offer a more attractive PPA rate to the BOE.

Below is a summary of ASP’s estimated production reported in their proposal as the PVWatts estimates.

	<b>System Size: (kW DC)</b>	<b>Expected System Output: (kWh)</b>	<b>Guaranteed System Output: (kWh)</b>
<b>ASP Option 1</b>	3,579.56	4,057,626	3,651,863.4
<b>ASP Option 2</b>	3,265.64	3,697,873	3,328,085.7

ASP’s expected system output at each facility complies with the less than ninety percent (90%) baseline annual usage. Furthermore, the conceptual layout reflected a thoughtful design strategy which demonstrated awareness of the potential design challenges presented by the existing conditions and equipment.

In comparison to the other Respondents and the Evaluation Team’s expectations, ASP was awarded fourteen points (14 points) out of the fifteen points (15 points) possible for the Design Strategy and Innovative Benefits portion of the evaluation.

HESP Solar:

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

**HESP Solar: Major System Components**

<b>System Component</b>	<b>Manufacturer</b>	<b>Compliance with Project Technical Specifications</b>
<b>PV Modules</b>	Waaree 540W Poly Silicon	Yes
<b>Inverters</b>	Yaskawa-Solectria Commercial String Inverters	Yes
<b>Rapid Shutdown</b>	APsmart – RSD-D MLPE	Yes
<b>Racking System</b>	Solar Mounts – Atlantis – Ballasted System Solar Mounts – Atlantis – T-Frame	Yes
<b>DAS</b>	Locus (AKA AlsoEnergy)	Yes

HESP confirmed the use of Tier 1 materials, either those listed above or equivalent. HESP’s equipment selection complied with the RFP.

The Evaluation Team evaluated HESP’s proposal which consisted of the mandatory proposal Option 1. HESP Option 1 included carport canopies at the High School, Eisenhower, and Lincoln Roosevelt, as well as roof arrays on all schools except the High School and Lincoln Roosevelt. HESP Option 1 has a total system size of 4,488.68 kW DC. HESP’s Option 1 has a guaranteed total system output of 4,604,411.7 kWh which represents 90 percent (90%) of the expected total system output as guaranteed output. HESP proposed system layout was compared to the conceptual site plan layout that was provided as part of the RFP and was found to be compliant.

HESP provided the PVWatts calculations for the systems substantiating the production calculations, below is a summary of the estimated production in their proposal.

	<b>System Size: (kW DC)</b>	<b>Expected System Output: (kWh)</b>	<b>Guaranteed System Output: (kWh)</b>
<b>HESP Option 1</b>	4,488.68	5,116,013	4,604,411.7

HESP’s expected system output at each facility complies with the less than ninety percent (90%) baseline annual usage. Furthermore, the conceptual layout reflected a thoughtful design strategy which demonstrated awareness of the potential design challenges presented by the development of solar on public schools.

In comparison to the other Respondents and the Evaluation Team’s expectations, HESP was awarded fourteen points (14 points) out of the fifteen points (15 points) possible for the Design Strategy and Innovative Benefits portion of the evaluation.

Solar Landscape:

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

**Solar Landscape: Major System Components**

<b>System Component</b>	<b>Manufacturer</b>	<b>Compliance with Project Technical Specifications</b>
<b>PV Modules</b>	Jinksolar – JKM580N-72HL4 – BDV – 580W	Yes
<b>Inverters</b>	Solar Edge – S1201	Yes
<b>Rapid Shutdown</b>	Solar Edge – SE210KUS and Sunny Highpower PEAK 3 125-US	Yes
<b>Racking System</b>	Panel Claw – clawFR 5° – Ballasted System RBI – Ground Mount	Yes
<b>DAS</b>	Solar-Log and AlsoEnergy	Yes

Solar Landscape confirmed the use of Tier 1 materials, either those listed above or equivalent. Solar Landscape’s equipment selection complied with the RFP.

The Evaluation Team considered Option 1 of a total system size of 4,481.9 kW DC, . Solar Landscape’s proposed system layout was compared to the conceptual site plan layout that was provided as part of the RFP and was found to be compliant. Solar Landscape, during their interview, did clarify that removing carport canopies would positively impact the project, schedule and economics because carports are costly and impact the PPA rate significantly, they were concerned that a carport in the bus area will impede parking and the flow of traffic.

Solar Landscape’s proposal Option 1 has a guaranteed total system output of 5,114,430 kWh which represent 90 percent (90%) of the expected total system output as guaranteed output. Solar Landscape provided the Helioscope calculations for the systems substantiating the production calculations, below is a summary of the estimated production in their proposal.

	<b>System Size: (kW DC)</b>	<b>Expected System Output: (kWh)</b>	<b>Guaranteed System Output: (kWh)</b>
<b>SL Option 1</b>	4,481.9	5,682,700	5,114,430

Solar Landscape’s expected system output at each facility complies with the less than ninety percent (90%) baseline annual usage. While Solar Landscape submitted two alternative Options, the Evaluation Team only considered Option 1 in its evaluation due to the exclusion of the carport canopies at the High School and inclusion of the High School roof, neither of which are deemed feasible by the BOE, in the alternative proposal Options.

Solar Landscape’s designs for the carports at the High School and Eisenhower included potential impacts to parking and school operations. In comparison to the other Respondents and the Evaluation Team’s expectations, Solar Landscape’s with twelve points (12 points) out of the fifteen points (15 points) possible for the Technical Proposal portion of the evaluation.

SunLight General Capital:

SunLight General Capital’s proposed equipment from the proposal and compliance to specifications are as follows:

**SunLight General Capital: Major System Components**

<b>System Component</b>	<b>Manufacturer</b>	<b>Compliance with Project Technical Specifications</b>
<b>PV Modules</b>	ZNshine Solar – ZXM7-SHLDD144 – 550W	Yes
<b>Inverters</b>	Solar Edge – SE(30,40,100)KUS	Yes
<b>Rapid Shutdown</b>	Solar Edge – P960	Yes
<b>Racking System</b>	KB Racking – Ekonorack 2.0	Yes
<b>DAS</b>	SolarEdge (AKA AlsoEnergy)	Yes

SunLight General Capital confirmed the use of Tier 1 materials, either those listed above or equivalent. SunLight General Capital’s equipment selection complied with the RFP.

---

The Evaluation Team compared Option 1 of a total system size of 4,674.1 kW DC. SunLight General Capital’s proposed system layout was compared to the conceptual site plan layout that was provided as part of the RFP and was found to be compliant.

SunLight General Capital’s proposal Option 1 has a guaranteed total system output of 5,297,019.3 kWh and represents 90 percent (90%) of the expected total system output as guaranteed output. Sunlight General Capital provided the Helioscope calculations for the systems substantiating the production calculations, below is a summary of the estimated production in their proposal.

	<b>System Size: (kW DC)</b>	<b>Expected System Output: (kWh)</b>	<b>Guaranteed System Output: (kWh)</b>
<b>SLG Option 1</b>	4,674.1	5,885,577	5,297,019.3

SunLight General Capital’s expected system output at each facility complies with the less than ninety percent (90%) baseline annual usage.

SunLight General Capital’s design included arrays in locations the Evaluation Team found unusable. In comparison to the other Respondents and the Evaluation Team’s expectations, SunLight General Capital’s with twelve points (12 points) out of the fifteen points (15 points) possible for the Technical Proposal portion of the evaluation.

## **b. Technical Approach and Construction Management**

The evaluation of the Technical Approach and Construction Management carries eighteen points (18 points) weighting in the evaluation.

Each Respondent was evaluated based on the project management and construction management, Operations & Maintenance (O&M), project schedule described in their proposals.

### Advanced Solar Products:

The ASP team indicated that Advanced Solar Products (ASP) will be providing the project management for these projects. ASP will serve as the EPC contractor for this project and will hire its long-term subcontractors to perform the electrical installation and civil engineering and site work. ASP will contract French & Parrello Associates (FPA) to perform all structural and civil engineering work on this project. FPA has extensive experience permitting solar projects in New Jersey and has worked with ASP on numerous projects. ASP will contract Lighton Industries to perform all electrical installation work on this project. Lighton is a full-service union contractor that has ties to all the local NJ union shops.

The BOE’s PV systems will be covered by ASP’s two-year warranty on parts and installation. ASP will be able to respond to any customer concerns and oversee any troubleshooting and repairs required within 24 hours of notification of an issue or concern.

---

The Evaluation Team awarded the ASP team with sixteen points (16 points) out of the eighteen points (18 points) possible for the Technical Approach and Construction Management portion of the evaluation.

HESP Solar:

HESP indicated that HESP Construction (HESP) will be the EPC firm for this project. HESP has verifiable experience with completing projects in a timely manner and maintaining project schedules. HESP acts as the general contractor and provides a full-time, on-site project manager to coordinate with the BOE's facilities personnel, manage the subcontractor teams, and manage deliveries, staging, and closeout. This on-site supervisor will report to the Chief Operating Officer of HESP Solar who will act as client contact and project manager for this project.

HESP anticipates semi-annual scheduled comprehensive preventative maintenance visits that include full electrical testing, visual checks, and thermal imaging, together with constant generation and alert monitoring with 24-hour dispatch of experienced and trained PV professionals.

The Evaluation Team awarded the HESP team with seventeen points (17 points) out of the eighteen points (18 points) possible for the Technical Approach and Construction Management portion of the evaluation.

Solar Landscape:

Solar Landscape indicated they will be the EPC firm for this project. Solar Landscape will assign a project manager, oversee engineering and construction. Solar Landscape will provide a dedicated on-site project manager to oversee the installation team. Solar Landscape has verifiable experience with completing projects in a timely manner and maintaining project schedules.

Solar Landscape indicated they will be self-performing the operation and maintenance for this project. They will be using their real-time monitoring system to track key performance indicators and will respond quickly in the event of a component failure. Solar Landscape anticipates a minimum of two service inspections per year during the term of the PPA and a 24-hour response time to any emergency.

In comparison to the other Respondents, the Evaluation Team awarded Solar Landscape with seventeen points (17 points) out of the eighteen points (18 points) possible for the Technical Approach and Construction Management portion of the evaluation.

SunLight General Capital:

The SunLight General Capital team indicated that SunLight General Capital will be providing the project management for these projects. SunLight General Capital is experienced with completing projects of this size and SunLight stated that the project manager for this project would be assigned at the start of the project and will lead the development, engineering, and constructions teams to deliver the completed project.

---

The SunLight General Capital team indicated that Azimuth 180, SunLight's wholly owned operations and maintenance company, would provide the operations and maintenance service for the term of the PPA. SunLight indicated they would perform semi-annual preventative maintenance inspections to evaluate all aspects of the system, monitoring platform and communication systems. All repairs and services that cannot be completed during the PM inspection will be recorded with additional site visits to be scheduled. SunLight responds to all emergencies on site. Site inspections are conducted following severe weather events, such as windstorms or excessive snowfall. An emergency response phone number and email address are provided to assure fast response times.

In comparison to the other Respondents, the Evaluation Team awarded the SunLight General Capital team with thirteen points (13 points) out of the eighteen points (18 points) possible for the Technical Approach and Construction Management portion of the evaluation.

---

---

## 6. Evaluation: Respondent Experience & Capability

The evaluation of the Respondent's Experience & Capability section carries a total of twenty-nine points (29 points) weighting in the evaluation. Each Respondent was evaluated in two categories on experience:

- Proposal Team Experience – fifteen points (15 points)
- Financial Capability – fourteen points (14 points)

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

### a. Proposal Team Experience

The Proposal Team Experience category focuses on each of the Respondent teams' experiences. The Evaluation Team valued the experience of the EPC firms as a greater impact to project success than the PPA provider's experience. This section carries a fifteen point (15 points) weight in the evaluation.

#### Advanced Solar Products / Spano Partners Holdings:

Advanced Solar Products (ASP) have extensive experience with developing, constructing, and operating solar projects. Advanced Solar Products (ASP) is one of the oldest solar EPC companies in New Jersey. The ASP/SP team have developed a large amount of solar in New Jersey.

ASP will be using Lighton Industries for the construction of this project, French & Parrello Associates (FPA) would conduct the structural analysis where required, and ASP will perform the design and procurement of solar arrays. Lighton Industries has completed many school installations in New Jersey, an extensive list of their completed projects was included in their Proposal. As a team, ASP, Lighton and FPA worked on several projects including their most recent school projects:

- North Brunswick Public Schools – (7 schools)
- Rutgers University
- North Hunterdon Voorhees School District – (2 schools)
- East Brunswick Public Schools – (5 schools)
- CCG Marketing
- Adamsville
- KSI Community Solar Portfolio
- Edison Board of Education
- Colts Neck Board of Education – (3 schools)
- Evesham Township BOE – (4 schools)
- Middletown Township Board of Education – (16 Schools)
- Delsea Regional School District – (2 Schools)
- Plainfield Public School District – (7 schools)
- Delaware Valley Regional High School – (1 School)



- 
- Allamuchy Elementary School – (1 School)
  - Hopewell Valley Central High School – (1 School)

Based on prior experience of the ASP and their subcontractors, the ASP team has been awarded fifteen points (15 points) out of the fifteen points (15 points) for this category.

HESP Solar:

HESP Solar indicated that HESP Construction (HESP) will be the EPC firm for this project. HESP provides EPC services solely to HESP and will serve as a project manager, oversee engineering and construction.

HESP has completed several school project installations in New Jersey including the following:

- West Caldwell BOE – (7 Schools)
- Elizabeth BOE – (2 Schools)
- South Brunswick School District – (14 Schools)
- Florham Park BOE – (3 Schools)
- Delran BOE – (2 Schools)
- Howell BOE – (16 Schools)
- Patterson BOE – (10 Schools)
- Manchester & Haledon School Districts – (2 Schools)
- Tenafly School District – (3 Schools)
- Plumsted School District – (2 Schools)
- Kingsway School District – (2 Schools)

Based on prior experience of HESP and that subcontractors for construction, the HESP team has been awarded fifteen points (15 points) out of the fifteen points (15 points) for this category.

Solar Landscape:

Solar Landscape has experience with developing, constructing, and operating solar projects in New Jersey.

Solar Landscape will be performing all aspects of engineering, permitting, and construction of this project. Solar Landscape will also be performing the maintenance and operation of the installed systems. Solar Landscape has completed several private commercial solar projects in New Jersey this list includes the following:

- Jewish Educational Center, Elizabeth, NJ
- Nourison Industries, Saddle Brook, NJ
- RPM Warehouse, Edison, NJ

- 
- Perfect Finishing, Clifton, NJ
  - Filo Factory, Bergen County, NJ
  - General Plumbing, Greenbrook, NJ
  - Morris Hills Regional School District – (2 Schools)
  - East Windsor Municipal Utilities – (1 ground array)
  - Asbury Park School District – (3 Schools)
  - Blackhorse Pike Regional School District, Runnemede, NJ

Based on prior experience of the Solar Landscape team, they have been awarded thirteen points (13 points) out of the fifteen points (15 points) for this category.

*SunLight General Capital:*

SunLight General Capital (SunLight) has a robust portfolio of over 500 projects. With more than 129 at educational institutions.

The SunLight General Capital (SunLight) team indicated that SunLight will be providing the project management for these projects and Azimuth 180, SunLight's wholly owned operations and maintenance company, would provide the operations and maintenance service for the term of the PPA.

- Sussex County, NJ
- Pequannock – Valley Middle School, Pequannock, NJ
- Somerset County, NJ
- Montgomery Township Middle & High School, Skillman, NJ
- Memorial Middle School, Little Ferry, NJ
- Teterboro Airport Hangar 117, Teterboro, NJ

Based on prior experience of SunLight General Capital team, they have been awarded thirteen points (13 points) out of the fifteen points (15 points) for this category.

## **b. Financial Capability**

Financial Capability includes the submission of required forms and information, the ownership structure of the Respondent and the project company, the project company financing strategy, the ability to perform work on-balance-sheet. The maximum points in this section is fourteen points (14 points).

Pursuant to Section 3.11 of the RFP, the Respondents were required to provide complete financial statements of the current fiscal year to date and the prior fiscal year. The financial statements were to include a balance sheet, statement of operations and statement of cash flows. The Respondent was also to provide any other information it deems relevant to demonstrate its financial strength. In the case of a subsidiary or affiliate, statements must include information with respect to the operating entity. All Respondents provided copies of their firm's financial statements.

---

---

The Evaluation Team also considered the scale of the project in relation to the financial capability of the Respondent team and financing strategies. The structure of the project company and Respondent firms was assessed and questioned during interviews.

Ultimately, the Evaluation Team awarded all four firms fourteen (14 points) out of the fourteen (14 points) possible points in this category.

## **7. Evaluation: Educational Value**

Respondents were required to submit a description and example of the educational materials and support that each Respondent could provide to the BOE in relation to this project. All Respondents were required to provide access to the raw data from the data acquisition system which could be used to verify invoices and in classrooms. In addition, all Respondents were required to include a display in each facility that is available for public viewing of the solar array production and benefits.

Respondents provided a range of education materials and support ranging from curriculum for each grade level to assemblies, science fairs, and job training. The Evaluation Team found all of the Respondents provided satisfactory educational value in their proposals.

Therefore, the Evaluation Team awards all respondents three points (3 points) out of a possible three points (3 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 substantial savings to the BOE, compared with continuing the current purchase strategy for electricity over the 15-year term. If the BOE 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 BOE.

In addition to economics, there will be other benefits to the BOE, including reduced carbon footprint, points in the Sustainable Jersey for Schools program, and a unique asset for student and community engagement. Proposals included educational content, including public displays, outreach efforts, and curriculum content.

The strongest ranked proposal is the proposal from Advanced Solar Products Option 2 (Alternative Option) with 97.0 points and provides a 15-year net present value (NPV) of savings of approximately \$3,292,332.

Based on the Evaluation Team's conclusions and the points allocated as described in the previous sections of this report, Advanced Solar Product's Option 2 (Alternative Option) received the highest score and provides the strongest overall proposal with the most overall benefit and the least overall risk to the BOE. The Evaluation Team recommends awarding the PPA to the highest ranked Respondent, Advanced Solar Products Option 2 (Alternative Option).

## Attachment 1 Solar Proposal Summary

Respondent	School	Solar Capacity (kW)	PPA Rate (\$/kWh)	Escalation Rate
ASP (Option 1)	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	2202	\$0.078	0.00%
	Roosevelt School	314		
	Franklin School	331		
	Kennedy School	244		
	Jefferson School	218		
	Nixon School	270		
ASP (Option 2)	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	2202	\$0.067	0.00%
	Roosevelt School	0		
	Franklin School	331		
	Kennedy School	244		
	Jefferson School	218		
	Nixon School	270		
HESP Solar	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	3023	\$0.099	2.00%
	Roosevelt School	348		
	Franklin School	363		
	Kennedy School	247		
	Jefferson School	227		
	Nixon School	280		
Solar Landscape (Option 1)	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	3,300	\$0.125	2.00%
	Roosevelt School	384		
	Franklin School	360		
	Kennedy School	256		
	Jefferson School	239		
	Nixon School	303		
Sunlight General	Eisenhower/Roxbury School	2,754	\$0.099	2.00%
	Roosevelt School	276		
	Franklin School	296		
	Kennedy School	315		
	Jefferson School	273		
	Nixon School	300		

**Attachment 2**  
**Proposal Ranking Evaluation Criteria**

CATEGORY	EVALUATION FACTOR	WEIGHTING	ASP 1	ASP 2	Solar Landscape	HESP Solar	SunLight General
Financial Benefits	NPV of Benefits	35	34.6	35.0	4.1	20.9	21.8
Design & Approach	Solar Design Strategy & Innovative Benefits	15	14	14	12	14	12
	Technical Approach & Construction Management	18	16	16	17	17	13
Respondent's Experience & Capability	Proposal Team Experience	15	15	15	13	15	13
	Financial Capability	14	14	14	14	14	14
Educational Value	Educational Materials	3	3	3	3	3	3
<b>Total Proposal</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>96.6</b>	<b>97.0</b>	<b>63.1</b>	<b>83.9</b>	<b>76.8</b>

**Attachment 3  
Economic Analysis**

Respondent	School	Solar Capacity (kWdc)	Expected Production (kWh)	PPA Rate (\$/kWh)	Escalation Rate	Estimated 15 year NPV Savings	Estimated 15 year NPV of Savings Combined
ASP (Option 1)	Eisenhower/Roxbury High School	2,202	2,251,490	\$0.0778	0.00%	\$1,855,689	<b>\$3,256,592</b>
	Roosevelt School	314	323,777			\$322,895	
	Franklin School	331	340,274			\$340,760	
	Kennedy School	244	243,916			\$243,214	
	Jefferson School	218	217,978			\$219,170	
	Nixon School	270	274,429			\$274,864	
ASP (Option 2)	Eisenhower/Roxbury High School	2,202	2,251,490	\$0.0671	0.00%	\$2,098,309	<b>\$3,292,332</b>
	Franklin School	331	340,274			\$377,428	
	Kennedy School	244	243,916			\$269,499	
	Jefferson School	218	217,978			\$242,660	
	Nixon School	270	274,429			\$304,436	
HESP	Eisenhower/Roxbury High School	3,023	3,457,868	\$0.0990	2.00%	\$992,810	<b>\$1,967,601</b>
	Roosevelt School	348	392,445			\$229,062	
	Franklin School	363	412,595			\$242,608	
	Kennedy School	247	278,368			\$163,326	
	Jefferson School	227	257,804			\$152,691	
	Nixon School	280	316,923			\$187,104	
SL (Option 1)	Eisenhower/Roxbury High School	3,300	3,861,000	\$0.1250	2.00%	-\$191,630	<b>\$384,541</b>
	Roosevelt School	384	435,400			\$135,697	
	Franklin School	360	437,600			\$139,213	
	Kennedy School	256	309,100			\$97,201	
	Jefferson School	239	286,800			\$91,758	
	Nixon School	303	352,800			\$112,302	
Sunlight Gen	Eisenhower/Roxbury High School	2,754	3,284,900	\$0.0990	2.00%	\$1,053,446	<b>\$2,053,672</b>
	Roosevelt School	276	319,180			\$189,747	

Franklin School	296	355,626		\$211,303
Kennedy School	315	366,045		\$205,254
Jefferson School	273	320,193		\$185,704
Nixon School	300	356,515		\$208,219



