

**Solar Photovoltaic System at Bryce A. Stuart Municipal Building**

| <b>MWBE Commitment</b>  |               |
|---|---------------|
| <b>Percent goal met or good faith effort made?</b>  | <b>Points</b> |
| Certified MWBE Compliance-Primary Vendor - (1) Submitted their M/WBE certificate in their proposal; OR (2) Will award required portion of the project to a named M/WBE certified subcontractor; OR (3) Has certified they made a good faith effort to comply but were unable to locate a qualified M/WBE subcontractor. | 5             |
| Not Qualified - Vendors proposal indicated that they do not qualify for the M/WBE certification nor do they comply with the M/WBE subcontract participation requirement.  | 0             |

| <b>Business Location</b>  |               |
|---------------------------|---------------|
|                           | <b>Points</b> |
| Within Winston-Salem      | 5             |
| Within North Carolina     | 3             |
| Outside of North Carolina | 0             |

| <b>Project Understanding &amp; Approach</b>   |               |
|---|---------------|
| <b>Response</b>   | <b>Points</b> |
| Superior: Proposer fully addresses all aspects of the criterion, convincingly demonstrates that it will meet the project's performance requirements, and demonstrates no weaknesses / success of our project seems certain  | 5             |
| Above Average: Proposer fully addresses all aspects of the criterion, solidly demonstrates a likelihood of meeting the project's requirements, success of our project seems high  | 4             |
| Average: Proposer addresses all aspects of the criterion and demonstrates the ability to meet the project's performance requirements, success of our project seems likely   | 3             |
| Below Average: Proposer does not address all aspects of the criterion nor is evidence presented indicating the likelihood of successfully meeting the project's requirements. Significant weaknesses are demonstrated and clearly outweigh any strengths presented. | 2             |
| <i>left blank intentionally</i>   |               |
| Poor: Proposer does not address all aspects of the criterion and the information presented indicates a strong likelihood of failure to meet the project's requirements.   | 0             |

| <b>Firm Experience/Job References</b>  |               |
|--|---------------|
| <b>Response</b>  | <b>Points</b> |
| Provided 6 or more verifiable references of similar projects, submitted installations demonstrates high proficiency in field/trade, product quality is or appears very high              | 5             |
| Provided 4-5 verifiable references of similar projects, submitted installations demonstrates high proficiency in field/trade, product quality is or appears higher than average          | 4             |
| Provided at least 3 verifiable references of similar projects, submitted installations demonstrates average proficiency in field/trade, product quality appears market average           | 3             |
| Provided 2 or fewer verifiable references with similar projects, submitted installations demonstrates average proficiency in field/trade, product quality appears slightly below average | 2             |
| Provided 2 or fewer verifiable references of similar projects, submitted installations are poor for field/trade, or provided dissimilar projects not to scale needed                     | 1             |
| Provided only 1 verifiable reference of a similar project, submitted installations are unsatisfactory for field/trade, or provided dissimilar projects not to scale needed               | 0             |

| <b>Renu Energy Solutions</b>     |               |              |                 |
|----------------------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|
| <b>Evaluation Criteria</b>       | <b>Weight</b> | <b>Grade</b> | <b>Total</b>    |
| MWBE Commitment                  | 20.00         | 1.00         | 20.00           |
| Business Location                | 20.00         | 0.00         | 0.00            |
| Project Understanding & Approach | 10.00         | 5.00         | 50.00           |
| Firm Experience/Job References   | 20.00         | 4.80         | 96.00           |
| Staff Qualifications             | 20.00         | 5.00         | 100.00          |
| Price Value                      | 10.00         | 2.00         | 20.00           |
| <b>Final Score</b>               |               |              | <b>286.00</b>   |
|                                  |               |              | Max Score = 500 |

| <b>Price Value</b>  |               |
|---|---------------|
| <b>Response</b>   | <b>Points</b> |
| Lowest price within budget  | 5             |
| 2nd lowest price within budget  | 4             |
| 3rd lowest price within budget  | 3             |
| 4th lowest price within budget or lowest price over stated budget     | 2             |
| 5th lowest price within budget or 2nd lowest price over stated budget | 1             |
| 6th lowest price within budget or 3rd lowest price over stated budget | 0             |

| <b>Staff Qualifications Response</b>  | <b>Points</b> |
|---|---------------|
| Proposed project team's experience fully addresses all aspects of the project criteria, convincingly demonstrates that it will meet the project's performance requirements, and demonstrates no weaknesses/success of our project seems certain | 5             |
| <i>left blank intentionally</i>   |               |
| Proposed project team's experience addresses all aspects of the project criteria with only a minor weakness or two  | 3             |
| <i>left blank intentionally</i>   |               |
| Proposed project team's experience does not address all aspects of the project criteria. Significant weaknesses are demonstrated that clearly outweigh any strengths presented.   | 1             |
| Proposed project team's experience does not address all aspects of the criteria and indicates a strong likelihood of failure to meet the project's requirements.  | 0             |