Attachment B

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer: Sterling Energy International, Inc.										Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	**80%**	**Panel #1**		**Panel #2**		**Panel #3**		**Panel #4**		**Panel #5**		**Percentage**	**Score**
Overall Responsivness	15%	4	12	4	12	5	15	4	12	4	12	13	10
Qualifications and Experience	15%	5	15	5	15	5	15	4	12	5	15	14	12
Approach and Methodology	30%	4	24	5	30	5	30	4	24	5	30	28	22
Proposed Staffing Plan	20%	5	20	5	20	5	20	4	16	5	20	19	15
Cost	20%	4	16	5	20	5	20	4	16	4	16	18	14
Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	**100%**	22.0	87.0	24.0	97.0	25.0	100.0	20.0	80.0	23.0	93.0	91	73
Oral Criteria	**20%**	**Panel #1**		**Panel #2**		**Panel #3**		**Panel #4**		**Panel #5**			
Overall Responsivness	15%	4	12	4	12	4	12	4	12	4	12	12	2
Qualifications and Experience	15%	4	12	3	9	4	12	4	12	4	12	11	2
Approach and Methodology	30%	5	30	4	24	5	30	4	24	4	24	26	5
Proposed Staffing Plan	20%	4	16	5	20	5	20	5	20	5	20	19	4
Cost	20%	4	16	3	12	4	16	4	16	4	16	15	3
Oral Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	**100%**	21.0	86.0	19.0	77.0	22.0	90.0	21.0	84.0	21.0	84.0	84	17
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	**100%**												90

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer: Veolia Energy Operating Services, LLC										Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	**80%**	**Panel #1**		**Panel #2**		**Panel #3**		**Panel #4**		**Panel #5**		**Percentage**	**Score**
Overall Responsivness	15%	3	9	3	9	3	9	3	9	4	12	10	8
Qualifications and Experience	15%	4	12	4	12	3	9	3	9	4	12	11	9
Approach and Methodology	30%	3	18	3	18	3	18	3	18	4	24	19	15
Proposed Staffing Plan	20%	2	8	2	8	2	8	2	8	3	12	9	7
Cost	20%	2	8	1	4	2	8	1	4	1	4	6	4
Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	**100%**	14.0	55.0	13.0	51.0	13.0	52.0	12.0	48.0	16.0	64.0	54	43
Oral Criteria	**20%**	**Panel #1**		**Panel #2**		**Panel #3**		**Panel #4**		**Panel #5**			
Overall Responsivness	15%	3	9	3	9	4	12	3	9	4	12	10	2
Qualifications and Experience	15%	3	9	4	12	4	12	4	12	4	12	11	2
Approach and Methodology	30%	2	12	3	18	4	24	2	12	4	24	18	4
Proposed Staffing Plan	20%	2	8	2	8	3	12	2	8	3	12	10	2
Cost	20%	3	12	2	8	3	12	3	12	3	12	11	2
Oral Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	**100%**	13.0	50.0	14.0	55.0	18.0	72.0	14.0	53.0	18.0	72.0	60	12
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	**100%**												55

Proposer's Name: Sterling Energy International, Inc.
Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	5	75
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	5	100
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	4	80
Respondent Total	100	22	435
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			87

Proposer's Name: Sterling Energy International, Inc.
Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	5	150
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	4	80
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	4	80
Respondent Total	100	21	430
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			86

Proposer's Name: Veolia Energy Operating Services, LLC
Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	3	45
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	2	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	2	40
Respondent Total	100	14	275
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			55

Proposer's Name: Veolia Energy Operating Services, LLC
Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	3	45
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	3	45
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	2	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	2	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	3	60
Respondent Total	100	13	250
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			50

Proposer's Name: Sterling Energy International, Inc.
Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	5	75
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	5	150
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	5	100
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	5	100
Respondent Total	100	24	485
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			97

Proposer's Name: Sterling Energy International, Inc.
Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	3	45
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	5	100
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	3	60
Respondent Total	100	19	385
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			77

Proposer's Name: Veolia Energy Operating Services, LLC
Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	3	45
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	2	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	1	20
Respondent Total	100	13	255
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			51

Proposer's Name: Veolia Energy Operating Services, LLC
Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	3	45
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	2	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	2	40
Respondent Total	100	14	275
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			55

Proposer's Name: Sterling Energy International, Inc.
Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	5	75
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	5	75
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	5	150
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	5	100
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	5	100
Respondent Total	100	25	500
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			100

Proposer's Name: Sterling Energy International, Inc.
Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	5	150
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	5	100
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	4	80
Respondent Total	100	22	450
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			90

Proposer's Name: Veolia Energy Operating Services, LLC
Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	3	45
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	3	45
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	2	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	2	40
Respondent Total	100	13	260
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			52

Proposer's Name: Veolia Energy Operating Services, LLC
Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	3	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	3	60
Respondent Total	100	18	360
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			72

Proposer's Name: Sterling Energy International, Inc.
Evaluator Number: 4

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	4	80
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	4	80
Respondent Total	100	20	400
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			80

Proposer's Name: Sterling Energy International, Inc.
Evaluator Number: 4

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	5	100
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	4	80
Respondent Total	100	21	420
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			84

Proposer's Name: Veolia Energy Operating Services, LLC
Evaluator Number: 4

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	3	45
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	3	45
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	2	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	1	20
Respondent Total	100	12	240
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			48

Proposer's Name: Veolia Energy Operating Services, LLC
Evaluator Number: 4

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	3	45
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	2	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	2	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	3	60
Respondent Total	100	14	265
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			53

Proposer's Name: Sterling Energy International, Inc.
Evaluator Number: 5

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	5	75
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	5	150
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	5	100
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	4	80
Respondent Total	100	23	465
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			93

Proposer's Name: Sterling Energy International, Inc.
Evaluator Number: 5

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	5	100
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	4	80
Respondent Total	100	21	420
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			84

Proposer's Name: Veolia Energy Operating Services, LLC
Evaluator Number: 5

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	3	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	1	20
Respondent Total	100	16	320
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			64

Proposer's Name: Veolia Energy Operating Services, LLC
Evaluator Number: 5

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.
Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Overall Responsiveness	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Demonstration of an understanding of the County's requirements as set forth in this RFP • Proposal was provided in the requested format, binders, tabbed • Proposal's detail, clarity, presentation and overall content • Proposal's completeness of response			
Qualifications and Experience	**15**	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's experience and qualifications in the service set forth in this RFP • Offeror's length of time in business, especially the length of time in business providing service similar to the set in this RFP • Relevant References • Professional Certifications			

Approach and Methodology	**30**	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's understanding of project scope and objectives • Operations – Power Generation and Chilled Water Supply; Operating Constraints • Maintenance – Cycle and Schedule • Response Times • Plant Operating Manual • Subcontractor • Environmental Compliance – Air Emissions Requirements • Sample Deliverables • Parts/Consumables Optimizations			
Proposed Staffing	**20**	3	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Organizational Chart/Key Personnel • Qualifications & Experience • Professional Certifications			
Cost	**20**	3	60
Respondent Total	100	18	360
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			72