

EVALUATION REPORT

**Evaluation of Proposals Received on
August 6, 2019 in Response to a Request for Proposals
for a Developer of a Photovoltaic System to be Located
on Lands Owned by the Township of Pittsgrove,
Salem County, New Jersey**



**Prepared for:
Township of Pittsgrove**

**By:
Pittsgrove Evaluation Team**

**Dated:
October 21, 2019**

Evaluation Report

Table of Contents

Report Sections	Page
Executive Summary	2
1. Overview of the RFP	6
2. Responses to the RFP	8
3. Decision Making Strategy and Proposal Evaluation Matrix	9
4. Evaluation: Financial Benefits	10
5. Evaluation: Technical Design & Approach	11
6. Evaluation: Respondent's Experience	14
7. Evaluation: Commercial Factors	16
8. Evaluation: Education Value	17
9. Recommendation	18

Attachments

Solar Proposal Summary	Attachment 1
Proposal Ranking Evaluation Matrix	Attachment 2
Economic Analysis Summary	Attachment 3
Sensitivity Analyses	Attachments 4

Executive Summary

On July 2, 2019, the Township issued a Request for Proposals ("RFP"), as amended, for a Lease of the Pittsgrove Township Landfill ("Landfill") located on Porchtown Road for the purpose of developing a solar project ("Lease")The RFP was issued in accordance with, a fair and open process under the New Jersey Local Unit Pay-to-Play Law, N.J.S.A.19:44A-20.4 et seq. This Report is being provided pursuant to the competitive contracting provisions of the Local Public Contracts Law, specifically, N.J.S.A. 40A:11-4.1(k); LFN 2008-20, dated December 3, 2008, Contracting for Renewable Energy Services; BPU protocol for measuring energy savings in 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, Local Redevelopment and Housing Law, N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-1 et seq.; and all other applicable law. ;

The purpose of the Evaluation Report is to provide the Township of Pittsgrove (hereafter referred to as "Township"), with an evaluation of proposals received for its planned solar project and to provide a recommendation to the Township.

The goal of the Township is to implement a solar energy project that is environmentally responsible, educational and economically beneficial to the Township. To this end, on July 2, 2019, the Township issued a Request for Proposals ("RFP"), as amended, for a Lease of the Pittsgrove Township Landfill ("Landfill") located on Porchtown Road for the purpose of developing a solar project ("Lease") all to be 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").

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 Lease Price Quotation Proposal Forms. The Successful Respondent will also have all ownership rights to the potential tax benefits and Solar Renewable Energy Certificates ("SRECs") generated by the System to be located on the Landfill and will monetize the SRECs.

The RFP contained technical, site specific requirements and the results of the preliminary feasibility assessment performed by the Township'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.

The RFP included two proposal options; one mandatory and one elective proposal option. Proposal Option 1 includes a ground-mounted Renewable Energy Project to be located on the Landfill pursuant to a Lease Agreement with the Township, Proposal Option 2 includes the same ground-mounted Renewable Energy Project and Lease Agreement from Option 1 as well as the opportunity to develop the Renewable Energy Project as a Community Solar Project, all as set forth in RFP.

Respondents were permitted to provide additional, alternative proposals based on their own due diligence, feasibility assessments, and alternative strategies, as long as the Respondents included a proposal on the mandatory proposal Option 1. Under the RFP, the Township retained sole discretion whether to consider these alternatives and to select the proposal option under which the Lease, if any, will be awarded. The Evaluation Team did not consider any of the alternative proposals provided by Respondents.

As set forth in the RFP, the Successful Respondent and the Township will enter into a 20-year Lease under which the Township will receive a lease payment based on the electricity produced from the System at a rate per kWh. Production will be guaranteed by the Successful Respondent. This Lease structure provides the Township with a revenue source from an otherwise unused property during the 20-year term of the Lease, in addition to other direct and indirect environmental and educational benefits that may be realized by the Township. At the conclusion of the Lease Term, the Township will have three options; the default option is for the Successful Respondent or system owner to remove the system at their cost, the Township will have the option to purchase the systems at a fair market value, and, if the law allows, an option for continued or renewed Lease. These last two options may result in potentially, significant long-term value for the remaining life of the equipment.

To evaluate proposals, the Township organized an evaluation team comprised of Committeepersons and supporting legal, energy and planning professionals (collectively, "Evaluation Team"). The Evaluation Team developed the RFP and evaluation criteria, administered the procurement process (including site visits, RFP addenda, and written Q&A), determined legal completeness and technical compliance of the proposals received, conducted interviews with proposing teams, completed a detailed economic analysis, performed a collective evaluation and proposal ranking by consensus, and drafted this consensus-based Evaluation Report for consideration by the Township 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 RFP¹.

The Township received proposals from four (4) solution providers (hereafter referred to as "Respondents") on August 6, 2019 in response to the RFP, including:

- Infinity Energy Solutions
- HESP Solar
- Advanced Solar Products
- EZenergy & Standard Solar

Following a legal and preliminary economic review, two (2) of the four proposals were considered complete and legally compliant with the requirements of the RFP. The other two (2) of the Respondents provided non-conforming proposals and are recommended for rejection by the Committee. The Evaluation Team then completed interviews of the two (2) compliant Respondents. The interviews were followed by a detailed technical and economic analysis,

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

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 two (2) proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria specified in the RFP. Table 1 below summarizes the scores for each of the proposals:

Table 1: Evaluation of Proposals

Respondent	Option	Lease Rate (\$/kWh)	Annual Escalation Rate	Score
HESP Solar	1	\$0.0290	1.0%	92
HESP Solar	2	\$0.0650	1.0%	N/A
EZnergy & Standard Solar	1	\$0.0239	0.0%	78
EZnergy & Standard Solar	2	\$0.0872	0.0%	N/A

Economic merit was evaluated in detail for each proposal. All proposed options provide potential economic value to the Township. The Evaluation Team found that the conservative and prudent way to evaluate these proposal was based solely on Option 1 pricing, because language allowing the Township and the Successful Respondent to pursue an Option 2 configuration will be included in any Lease Agreement entered into by the Township and the Successful Respondent which will provide opportunity for the Township to release additional revenue from the Lease should the Successful Respondents proposed project be accepted by the BPU into the Community Solar Energy Pilot Program. EZnergy & Standard Solar’s alternative proposals were not considered by the Evaluation Team due to the added contingencies associated with each alternative option proposed.

Standard Solar and EZnergy’s proposal Option 1 offered the Township a grid connected solar project located on the Township’s Landfill as required by the RFP. However, in addition to the Lease agreement discussed in the RFP, proposal their Option 1 also required the Township to enter into a contract to virtually purchase power from the solar project through aggregated or remote net metering. The RFP did not specifically prohibit proposals that included virtual power purchase agreements and as such Standard Solar/EzEnergy’s proposal was deemed to be compliant with the requirements of the RFP

The strongest ranked proposal under mandatory Option 1 is from HESP Solar, which provides an estimated revenue of approximately \$80,258 in the first year and an approximate 20-year net present value (NPV) of revenue of \$1,040,392.

The Evaluation Team finds that the proposals deliver meaningful value for the Township, are competitive with current market practice, and deliver other benefits that are significant. Based

on an evaluation of price and other factors, the Evaluation Team recommends awarding the Lease to the highest ranked Respondent under Option 1, HESP Solar.

1. Overview of the RFP

On July 2, 2019, Township issued a RFP for a Lease of the Pittsgrove Township Landfill to develop a renewable energy solar photovoltaic System to be financed, designed, installed, owned, operated and maintained by the Successful Respondent. The Township sought proposals for a mandatory "Option 1" as set forth in Article II of the RFP, which was for a lease payment based on selling the electricity generated from the System to the wholesale electricity market. Township also encouraged, but did not require, Respondents to submit proposals for an additional option. Option 2 was for a lease payment based on selling the electricity generated from the System through a community solar structured arrangement. The Community Solar Energy Pilot Program is a new pilot program from the BPU that allows for solar to be installed in locations ideal for solar production, such as landfills like the Township's, and for the electricity generated to be credited to a community solar subscriber's utility account.

The Successful Respondent and the Township will enter into a Lease for 20 years under which Township will receive a lease payment at a fixed rate per kWh. 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, the sale of Solar Renewable Energy Certificates ("SRECs") in the competitive SREC market, federal tax benefits (i.e. both investment tax credits and accelerated depreciation) and investor capital. At the end of the Lease term, the Township will have three options; (a) have the System removed at the Successful Respondent's expense; or (b) renegotiation of an extension of the Lease, if desired; or (c) purchase the System by the Township at fair market value ("FMV").

Proposals were evaluated on the basis of price and non-price criteria, in accordance with competitive contracting provisions of the Local Public Contracts Law, specifically, N.J.S.A. 40A:11-4.1(k); LFN 2008-20, dated December 3, 2008, Contracting for Renewable Energy Services; BPU protocol for measuring energy savings in PPA agreements (Public Entity Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Cost Savings Guidelines, dated February 20, 2009); LFN 2009-10, dated June 12, 2009, Contracting for Renewable Energy Services: Update on Power Purchase Agreements, Local Redevelopment and Housing Law, N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-1 et seq.; and all other applicable law. Components of the RFP are as follows:

a) Solar Systems Size

A preliminary feasibility assessment was performed by the Township's energy consultant, Gabel Associates, to identify the technical potential for a solar system at the Township. Based upon this conservative, preliminary assessment, the System was estimated to have a total capacity of approximately of 3,000 kW DC depending on the area included and design approach. The RFP also included conceptual layouts designated the areas of the roof that are available for the installation of solar arrays based on discussion with the Township and its professionals.

b) Pricing and Other Commercial Requirements

The RFP required the Respondents to propose with system sizes, production guarantees, a Lease Price, and an annual escalation rate, if any, for every proposal submitted. The Township included

in the RFP a reserve lease price of \$0.01/kWh meaning all proposals had to have a lease price of at least \$0.01/kWh to be accepted by the Township. In addition, all Respondents were required to provide a price adjustment factor to account for any increase in project development cost and unforeseen electrical interconnection or structural improvement costs. These adjustment factors, if applied, will be subtracted from the proposed Lease Prices and will provide a controlled way for unforeseen cost changes to be handled after award, if required.

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

- Proposal Option 1 - Lease Price Quotation Sheets
- Proposal Option 2 - Lease Price Quotation Sheets
- Respondent Information/Cover Letter
- Consent of Surety
- Form of Construction Performance Bond
- Agreement for Proposal Security in Lieu of Proposal Bond
- Proposal Bond
- Ownership Disclosure Statement
- Non-Collusion Affidavit
- Consent to Investigation
- Statement of Respondent's Qualifications
- Acknowledgement of Receipt of Addenda
- Affirmative Action Compliance Notice/Mandatory EEO Language
- Disclosure of Investment Activities in Iran
- Proposal Checklist
- Political Contribution Form C. 271
- Public Works Contractor Certificate (*N.J.S.A 34:11 56.51*)
- Notice of Classification (*RFP Section 4.14*)
- Total Amount of Uncompleted Contracts Form DPMC701 (*RFP Section 4.14*)
- Business Registration Certificate (*RFP Section 4.12*)

The RFP also contained specific standard terms that were to be included in the Lease 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.

The Township's energy consultant, Gabel Associates, contacted the local electric distribution company, Atlantic City Electric (ACE), to inquire about interconnection difficulty. Currently, the Township has reason to believe that the ACE interconnection approval could require additional equipment, upgrades to ACE infrastructure or a dedicated feeder. 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. Depending on the outcome of the post-award due diligence that will be performed by the Successful Respondent,

the Project may not be interconnected to ACE, but instead may be interconnected to the regional transmission organization, PJM.

d) Evaluation Process

To evaluate proposals, the Township organized an evaluation team comprised of: Township Committee Members, Francesca Spinelli and Jake Botticello; Sarah Birdsall, PP of Sarah Birdsall, Planning Consulting; Ryan J. Scerbo, Esq., of DeCotiis, Fitzpatrick, Cole & Giblin; and Andrew Conte, CEM of Gabel Associates (collectively, "Evaluation Team") with support from Brian Bizjak of Gabel Associates. The Evaluation Team developed the RFP, administered the procurement process (including site visits, RFP addenda, and written Q&A), determined legal completeness and technical compliance of the proposals received, conducted oral interviews with proposing teams, completed a detailed evaluation and proposal ranking, and drafted this consensus Evaluation Report for consideration by the Township in making an award decision.

The following milestones summarize the RFP development and evaluation process:

- 7/2/19 – RFP Issued
- 7/3/19 – Formal Written Addenda No. 1
- 7/11/19 – Pre-proposal Conference and Site Tours
- 7/16/19 – Formal Written Addenda No. 2
- 7/31/19 – Formal Written Addenda No. 3 & Q&A No. 1
- 8/9/19 – Proposals Received
- 10/7/19 – Oral Interviews with Compliant Respondents
- 10/9/19 – Meeting with the Township Committee in Closed Session
- 10/15/19 – Meeting of Evaluation Team to Rank Proposals
- 10/21/19 – Evaluation Report Issued

2. Responses to the RFP

The Township received four (4) proposals and evaluated two (2) compliant proposals in response to the RFP as outlined in Table 2. Two of the proposal received were non-compliant with the requirements of the RFP and therefore were not evaluated and are recommended for rejection. Each Respondent consisted of a team made up of, at a minimum, a project developer (typically the contract partner "Lease Provider") and an Engineering, Procurement and Construction ("EPC") company. Under this structure, the Lease Provider is responsible for the financing, design, permitting, acquisition, construction, installation, operation and maintenance of the Systems. To accomplish this task, the firm leasing the Landfill will contract with an EPC to complete the required engineering and construction work.

Table 2: Overview of Respondent Teams

Lease Provider	EPC
HESP Solar (HESP)	HESP Construction (HESP)
Standard Solar	EZenergy

These proposals provided all the necessary documentation as required of Respondents by the RFP and were deemed compliant with the RFP. Standard Solar and EZnergy’s proposal Option 1 offered the Township a grid connected solar project located on the Township’s Landfill as required by the RFP. However, in addition to the Lease agreement discussed in the RFP, proposal Option 1 also required the Township to enter into a contract to virtually purchase power from the solar project through aggregated or remote net metering. The RFP did not specifically prohibit proposals that included virtual power purchase agreements and as such Standard Solar/EzEnergy’s proposal was deemed to be compliant with the requirements of the RFP. Table 3 provides an overview of the compliant proposals that were submitted to the Township.

Table 3: Overview of Received Proposals*

	HESP Solar		EZnergy & Standard Solar	
Lease Payment Option 1		\$ 0.0290		\$ 0.0239
Escalator		1%		0%
PDC Adjustment		\$ 0.0001		\$ 0.00028
Adjustment Factor	\$10,000-\$20,000	\$ 0.0001	\$150,001-\$199,999	\$ 0.00560
	\$20,000-\$30,000	\$ 0.0002	\$200,000-\$249,999	\$ 0.00140
	\$30,000	\$ 0.0005	\$250,000	\$ 0.00140
Lease Payment Option 2		\$ 0.0650		\$ 0.0872
Escalator		1%		0%
PDC Adjustment		\$ 0.0001		\$ 0.00030
Adjustment Factor	\$10,000-\$20,000	\$ 0.0001	\$150,001-199,999	\$ 0.00600
	\$20,000-\$30,000	\$ 0.0002	\$200,000-249,999	\$ 0.00160
	\$30,000	\$ 0.0005	\$250,000	\$ 0.00160
System Size	kW	2,182.40		3,381.60
Expected Production	kWh	3,075,002		4,331,109
Guaranteed Production	kWh	2,767,501		3,897,998

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

3. Decision Making Strategy and Proposal Evaluation Matrix

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

Economic merit, as determined by estimated net revenue from Option 1 Lease Prices, 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 Matrix used for proposal ranking, which was also included in the RFP, is as follows:

CATEGORY	EVALUATION FACTOR	WEIGHTING
Financial Benefits	NPV of Benefits	40
Design & Approach	Design Strategy	7
	Technical Approach	10
Respondent's Experience & Capability	Proposal Team Experience	10
	Financial Capability	10
Commercial Factors	Commercial Term in Lease	20
Educational Value	Educational Materials	3
Total Proposal		100

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

4. Evaluation: Financial Benefits

Township realizes economic benefits from the installation of this solar project at the Landfill through Lease payments that are based on the energy produced from the solar array.

To calculate the estimated revenue for the Township, Gabel Associates prepared an analysis of the proposed Option 1 Lease Prices, Guaranteed Production, and the changes in the values over the term of the agreement. In addition to this Gabel Associates developed multiple sensitivity analyses that include a sensitivity with a potential \$1,000,000 of interconnection cost and the appropriate adjustment factors applied, a sensitivity with a potential \$500,000 of interconnection cost and the appropriate adjustment factors applied, a sensitivity using the total estimated production, and a sensitivity using the Option 2 Lease Prices. Adjustment factors were applied cumulatively adding the factors to one another based on the amount of interconnection cost included in the sensitivity. This ensured a conservative assessment of the potential application of adjustment factors.

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

multiplied by the per-kwh lease price. All revenues 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 Lease Price and the annual escalator, but also of the size of the System. Please see **Attachment 3** for a summary of the economic analysis results.

Currently, the New Jersey solar incentive and solar market are in transition between the legacy SREC program and new transition and successor programs. There are many uncertainties at this time, but all Respondents confirmed during interviews that their proposed Lease Price would not change if the SREC program ends and a new and likely less lucrative incentive program is created to replace it.

The Evaluation Matrix contains 40 points for Financial Benefits, which are awarded proportionally based on 20-year NPV of the Lease valuation analysis of the proposed system sizes and guaranteed production values. The proposal with the highest NPV is awarded the full 40 points for economic merit, and the remaining projects are awarded points in proportion to their savings NPV relative to the best proposal in the group.

Of the two (2) evaluated proposal submissions received for the mandatory Option 1, HESP Solar had the highest NPV and was awarded 40 points. Standard Solar/EZnergy had the second best NPV and was awarded 35 points in this category.

5. Evaluation: Design & Approach

The evaluation of the Design & Approach has two major criteria; Design Strategy and Technical Approach. Each of these areas will be discussed, reviewed, and rated for each of the respondents' proposals.

a) Design Strategy

The Design Strategy in each of the proposals were evaluated based on reviewing the preliminary system layout, sizing and production as well as the major system components. The following section provides an explanation of the review of the solar system layout, sizing and production. This section includes a table for each Respondent along with an overview of the system components that are utilized in each Respondent's preliminary solar design as well as each proposed system's compliance with the site specific and technical requirements from the RFP Appendices B and C. The Design Strategy section has a maximum of Seven (7) points to be awarded.

HESP Solar:

The Evaluation Team compared the total system size for both Option 1 and Option 2 of 2,182.40 kW DC. HESP Solar's proposed system layout was compared to the conceptual site plan layout that was provided as part of the RFP and were found to be compliant.

The HESP Solar's proposed Option 1 and Option 2 has a guaranteed output of 2,767,501 kWh. All proposed options represent 90% of the expected total system output as guaranteed output.

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

Proposal Option	Total System Size (kW DC)	Expected Total System Output (kWh)	Guaranteed Total System Output (kWh)
Option 1	2,182.40	3,075,002	2,767,501
Option 2	2,182.40	3,075,002	2,767,501

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

HESP Solar: Major System Components

System Component	Manufacturer	Compliance with Project Technical Specifications
PV Modules	Trina Solar – TSM-DE14A(11) PERC MONO – 375 W	Yes
Inverters	Yaskawa-Solectria – PVI – String Inverters	Yes
Racking System	Patriot Solar Group – Delta Ballasted Mounting System	Yes
DAS	Locus Energy (AKA – Also Energy)	Yes

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

HESP Solar’s proposed system size was smaller than the other proposer’s with less production and it did not take into account the existing landfill ventilation pipes. The Evaluation Team found that while the system size could change during the design and approval process, the largest feasible system is preferred. Therefore, HESP Solar was awarded four (4) out of the seven (7) possible points for this category.

Standard Solar / EZnergy:

The Evaluation Team compared the total system size for both Option 1 and Option 2 of 3,381.60 kW DC. Standard Solar / EZnergy’s proposed system layout was compared to the conceptual site plan layout that was provided as part of the RFP and were found to be compliant.

The Standard Solar / EZnergy’s proposed Option 1 and Option 2 has a guaranteed output of 3,897,998 kWh. All proposed options represent 90% of the expected total system output. Standard Solar / EZnergy used PVwatts for their production estimates, below is a summary of the estimated production in their proposal.

Proposal Option	Total System Size: (kW DC)	Expected Total System Output: (kWh)	Guaranteed Total System Output: (kWh)
Option 1	3,381.60	4,331,109	3,897,998
Option 2	3,381.60	4,331,109	3,897,998

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

Standard Solar / EZnergy: Major System Components

System Component	Manufacturer	Compliance with Project Technical Specifications
PV Modules	Hanwha – 390 W	Yes
Inverters	Chint or Solectria – String Inverter	Yes
Racking System	GenMounts – Ballasted Solar Racking System	Yes
DAS	Locus Energy (AKA – Also Energy)	Yes

Standard Solar / EZnergy confirmed the use of Tier 1 materials, either those listed above or equivalent. Standard Solar / EZnergy’s equipment selection were in compliance with the RFP.

Standard Solar / EZnergy’s proposed system size was larger than the other proposer’s with less production. The Evaluation Team found that while the system size could change during the design and approval process, the largest feasible system is preferred. Therefore, Standard Solar / EZnergy was awarded six (6) out of the seven (7) possible points for this category.

b) Technical Approach

The Technical Approach section of the report will evaluate the proposers overall solar design practices and methods for ensuring successful completion including their respective project management approach, construction ability, subcontractors, and examples of other successfully completed projects. The Technical Approach section has a maximum of ten (10) points to be awarded.

HESP Solar:

HESP Solar indicated that they will be providing the project management services for this project. HESP Solar has verifiable experience with completing projects. HESP Solar will have a project manager who will be responsible for the successful completion of the project. HESP Solar indicated they would participate in weekly meetings during construction to provide construction status and projected construction efforts.

HESP Solar indicated that HESP Construction will be the EPC firm for this project. HESP Construction has completed several projects in New Jersey. HESP Construction has in development or completed projects include:

- Jackson Landfill, Jackson, NJ (Expected to begin construction, October 2019)
- Mount Arlington Landfill, Mt. Arlington, NJ (Expected to begin construction, November 2019)
- South Brunswick School District, South Brunswick, NJ (14 Schools)

-
- Stafford School District, Stafford, NJ (5 Schools)
 - Jackson Landfill, Jackson NJ
 - Tenafly School District, Tenafly, NJ (3 Schools)
 - Plumsted School District, New Egypt, NJ (2 Schools)

HESP Solar demonstrated familiarity and confidence with the site and project constraints. HESP Solar's approach to operation and monitoring and plan for managing vegetation met and exceeded the expectations of the Evaluation Team. HESP Solar was awarded the full ten (10) out of the possible ten (10) points for this category.

Standard Solar / EZnergy:

The Standard Solar / EZnergy team indicated that EZnergy will be providing the project management services, with oversight provided by Standard Solar. EZnergy has verifiable experience with completing projects in a timely manner and maintaining project schedules. EZnergy will have an on-site project manager during construction. EZnergy will schedule weekly construction update meetings and will provide staging plans prior to the start of construction.

Standard Solar / EZnergy will be using EZnergy as the EPC. EZnergy has completed several projects in New Jersey. EZnergy completed projects include:

- Brick Landfill, Brick, NJ
- Readington School District, Readington, NJ (3 Schools)
- Willingboro Township, Willingboro, NJ (6 Schools)
- Tenafly School District, Tenafly, NJ (3 Schools)

Standard Solar / EZnergy proposed placing crushed stone on the cap of the landfill and then place the racking on top of the stone. Their proposal also demonstrated a lack of familiarity with the site and the available incentive programs. The Standard Solar / EZnergy team was awarded seven (7) out of the possible ten (10) points for this category.

6. Evaluation: Respondent's Experience & Capability

Each Respondent was evaluated on experience, which includes the following; Proposal Team Experience and Financial Capability. Each of these areas will be discussed, reviewed, and rated for each of the respondents' proposals.

a) Proposal Team Experience

The Evaluation Team recognizes that all of the firms included in the proposal are all individually experienced firms with solar. 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 lessee's experience. The maximum number of point available in the Proposal Team Experience is ten (10).

HESP Solar:

HESP Solar indicated that HESP Construction will be the EPC firm for this project. HESP Construction provides EPC services solely to HESP Solar and will serve as a project manager, oversee engineering and construction. Additional work is proposed to be completed by a structural and electrical engineering firm licensed in the state of New Jersey and other subcontractors which were not identified in HESP's proposal.

HESP Solar has completed several solar projects in New Jersey including the following:

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

HESP has in development the following:

- Jackson Landfill, Jackson, NJ (Expected to begin construction, October 2019)
- Mount Arlington Landfill, Mt. Arlington, NJ (Expected to begin construction, November 2019)

HESP Solar does not have a robust history of developing landfill solar projects, but HESP Solar is currently developing the two landfill projects listed above. Therefore, HESP Solar was awarded eight (8) out of the ten (10) possible points in this category.

Standard Solar / EZnergy:

Standard Solar / EZnergy will be using EZnergy as the EPC. Standard Solar is relatively unknown in the New Jersey public entity solar market. EZnergy has completed several projects in New Jersey including:

- Brick Landfill, Brick, NJ
- Readington School District, Readington, NJ (3 Schools)
- Willingboro Township, Willingboro, NJ (6 Schools)
- Tenafly School District, Tenafly, NJ (3 Schools)

The Standard Solar / EZnergy team has not constructed any landfill solar projects as the team of Standard Solar and EZnergy. Similarly, Standard Solar / EZnergy team has not been awarded any solar projects as a team. Furthermore, Standard Solar has not entered into any landfill lease solar projects with any public entity in New Jersey. There were indications of miscommunications amongst the team members. For these reasons, the Evaluation Team has awarded Standard Solar / EZnergy five (5) out of the possible ten (10) points for this category.

b) Financial Capability

The Financial Capability category focuses specifically on whether the Respondent demonstrated they have the finances available to initiate and complete this project. The Evaluation Team also assessed the risk of a potential bankruptcy proceeding and the ability in such a situation for the Respondent to maintain the project. The Evaluation Team agreed that both Respondents presented sufficient information to demonstrate the financial ability to construct the project. HESP Solar indicated that they would form a Special Purpose Entity (SPE) and bring on a tax equity partner at the end of construction. Standard Solar indicated that this project would be carried on their balance sheet. The Evaluation Team finds that both approaches are not without risk. Therefore, the Evaluation Team awarded all Respondents, nine (9) points out of the possible ten (10) points in this category.

7. Evaluation: Commercial Factors

Each Respondent was evaluated on the following commercial factors; Production Guaranty (including guarantying the existing system production in Option 2), Lease Adjustment Factors, and Requested Lease changes or additional contract requirements.

Each of the Respondents were asked to provide a production guaranty. In the industry it is typical to provide a ninety percent (90%) production guaranty. The Evaluation Team found that both Respondents included a 90% production guaranty.

Each of the Respondents were asked to indicate on the Proposal Quotation Form included in the RFP adjustment factors for unforeseen project costs that are imposed by the local utility during the interconnection process. All of the Respondents proposed adjustment factors that were of the expected magnitude. Standard Solar / EZnergy proposed that they would need to apply adjustment factors if the interconnection costs require an investment greater than \$150,000 and in increments for each \$50,000 over \$150,000 up to \$250,000. HESP Solar proposed that they would need to apply adjustment factors if the interconnection costs require an investment greater than \$200,000 and in increments of \$10,000 over \$200,000 up to \$30,000.

Each of the Respondents were asked to indicate on the Proposal Quotation Form included in the RFP whether their proposal would require material changes to the Form Lease Agreement provided in Appendix A-1 of the RFP. As noted earlier in this Report, Standard Solar / EZnergy's proposal Option 1 required the Township to enter into a contract to virtually purchase power from the solar project in addition to a land lease. Because the virtual power purchase agreement was an essential component of Standard Solar / EZnergy's proposal Option 1, the Evaluation Team evaluated the requirement for said agreement as part of the evaluation of the Commercial Terms for proposal Option 1 and 1A. Virtual agreement like the one proposed by Standard Solar / EZnergy's are relatively unproven in New Jersey. Further, such agreements can also trigger certain fees / assessments applied by the Electric Utility. These additional costs can affect the economic visibility of a virtual power purchase arrangement. An additional agreement would also present an additional layer of potential risk to the Township. For these reasons the

Evaluation Team decided to award Standard Solar/EzEnergy's proposal Option 1 thirteen (13) out of twenty (20) possible points.

HESP Solar did not indicate any need for changes to the Form Lease Agreement included in Appendix A-1. As stated above, HESP Solar's adjustment factors are for less interconnection costs than those proposed by Standard Solar / EZnergy. The Evaluation Team awarded HESP Solar eighteen (18) of the possible twenty (20) points for this category.

8. Evaluation: Education Value

The Township recognized that the solar system could serve as a significant asset for enhancing learning about solar energy and community engagement. The RFP encouraged Respondents to highlight an educational component as part of their proposal. The Evaluation Team assessed the merit of this educational component by considering the value of displays and outreach programs.

Both Respondents provided descriptions of the types of education materials that they will make available for the township as part of their proposal. Both Respondents indicated that the Township will have access to the raw data from the data acquisition systems and weather station as part of this project as well as various:

- Presentations
- Staff Training

Both Respondents received the maximum, three (3) points for this category.

9. Recommendation

The RFP process attracted a competitive response from the solar market. Following a legal and technical review, two (2) 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 value to the Township for this otherwise unused property over the 20-year term. A property that due to the Township's Redevelopment Plan cannot be used for anything except renewable energy production. If the Township 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). Based on these economic considerations, the Evaluation Team believes that the implementation of a solar project would be beneficial for the Township.

In addition to economics, there will be other benefits to the Township, including reducing the carbon footprint of electricity generation, publicity and recognition for being a leader in sustainable energy, and a unique asset for community engagement. Proposals included educational content, including public displays, outreach efforts, and access to data.

The strongest ranked proposal under mandatory Option 1 is from HESP Solar, provides an estimated revenue of approximately \$80,258 in the first year and an approximate 20-year net present value (NPV) of revenue of \$1,040,392.

The Evaluation Team finds that the two conforming proposals deliver meaningful value for the Township, are competitive with current market practice, and deliver other benefits that are significant. All compliant proposals were ranked by the Evaluation Team, based on consideration of price and other factors. Based on the Evaluation Team's consensus and conclusions, the points allocated as described in the previous sections of this report, HESP Solar received the highest score and provides the most benefit with the least risk to the Township. The Evaluation Team recommends awarding the Lease to the highest ranked Respondent.

Attachment 1 Solar Proposal Summary

	HESP Solar		EZnergy & Standard Solar	
Total Project Cost		\$ 4,753,500		\$ 5,606,440
Project Development Costs		\$ 189,500		\$ 189,500
Estimated INX Budget		\$ 200,000		\$ 150,000
RE Project Cost		\$ 4,364,000		\$ 5,266,940
Lease Payment Option 1		\$ 0.0290		\$ 0.0239
Escalator		1%		0%
PDC Adjustment		\$ 0.0001		\$ 0.00028
Adjustment Factor	\$10,000-\$20,000	\$ 0.0001	150,001-199,999	\$ 0.00560
	\$20,000-\$30,000	\$ 0.0002	200,000-249,999	\$ 0.00140
	\$30,000	\$ 0.0005	250,000	\$ 0.00140
Lease Payment Option 2		\$ 0.0650		\$ 0.0872
Escalator		1%		0%
PDC Adjustment		\$ 0.0001		\$ 0.00030
Adjustment Factor	\$10,000-\$20,000	\$ 0.0001	150,001-199,999	\$ 0.00600
	\$20,000-\$30,000	\$ 0.0002	200,000-249,999	\$ 0.00160
	\$30,000	\$ 0.0005	250,000	\$ 0.00160
System Size	kW	2,182.40		3,381.60
Expected Production	kWh	3,075,002		4,331,109
Guaranteed Production	kWh	2,767,501		3,897,998

Attachment 2
Proposal Ranking Evaluation Matrix

CATEGORY	EVALUATION FACTOR	WEIGHTING	Standard Solar/EZnergy	HESP Solar
Financial Benefits	NPV of Benefits	40	35	40
Design & Approach	Design Strategy	7	6	4
	Technical Approach	10	7	10
Respondent's Experience & Capability	Proposal Team Experience	10	5	8
	Financial Capability	10	9	9
Commercial Factors	Commercial Term in Lease	20	13	18
Educational Value	Educational Materials	3	3	3
Total		100	78	92

Attachment 3 Economic Analysis

Option 1

HESP Solar						EZenergy & Standard Solar					
Year	Guaranteed Production (kWh)	Proposed Lease Payment \$/kWh	Proposed Lease Payment with \$500K in INX Cost \$/kWh	Estimated Revenue - Proposed Lease \$	Estimated Revenue - with \$500K in INX Cost \$	Year	Guaranteed Production (kWh)	Proposed Lease Payment \$/kWh	Proposed Lease Payment with \$500K in INX Cost \$/kWh	Estimated Revenue - Proposed Lease \$	Estimated Revenue - with \$500K in INX Cost \$
1	2,767,501	\$ 0.0290	\$ 0.02420	\$ 80,258	\$ 66,974	1	3,897,998	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 93,240.11	\$ 63,771.25
2	2,753,663	\$ 0.0293	\$ 0.02444	\$ 80,655	\$ 67,305	2	3,878,508	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 92,773.91	\$ 63,452.39
3	2,739,895	\$ 0.0296	\$ 0.02469	\$ 81,054	\$ 67,638	3	3,859,115	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 92,310.04	\$ 63,135.13
4	2,726,196	\$ 0.0299	\$ 0.02493	\$ 81,455	\$ 67,973	4	3,839,820	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 91,848.49	\$ 62,819.45
5	2,712,565	\$ 0.0302	\$ 0.02518	\$ 81,858	\$ 68,309	5	3,820,621	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 91,389.25	\$ 62,505.36
6	2,699,002	\$ 0.0305	\$ 0.02543	\$ 82,264	\$ 68,648	6	3,801,518	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 90,932.30	\$ 62,192.83
7	2,685,507	\$ 0.0308	\$ 0.02569	\$ 82,671	\$ 68,987	7	3,782,510	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 90,477.64	\$ 61,881.87
8	2,672,079	\$ 0.0311	\$ 0.02595	\$ 83,080	\$ 69,329	8	3,763,598	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 90,025.25	\$ 61,572.46
9	2,658,719	\$ 0.0314	\$ 0.02621	\$ 83,491	\$ 69,672	9	3,744,780	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 89,575.13	\$ 61,264.59
10	2,645,425	\$ 0.0317	\$ 0.02647	\$ 83,905	\$ 70,017	10	3,726,056	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 89,127.25	\$ 60,958.27
11	2,632,198	\$ 0.0320	\$ 0.02673	\$ 84,320	\$ 70,364	11	3,707,425	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 88,681.62	\$ 60,653.48
12	2,619,037	\$ 0.0324	\$ 0.02700	\$ 84,737	\$ 70,712	12	3,688,888	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 88,238.21	\$ 60,350.21
13	2,605,942	\$ 0.0327	\$ 0.02727	\$ 85,157	\$ 71,062	13	3,670,444	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 87,797.02	\$ 60,048.46
14	2,592,912	\$ 0.0330	\$ 0.02754	\$ 85,578	\$ 71,414	14	3,652,092	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 87,358.03	\$ 59,748.22
15	2,579,948	\$ 0.0333	\$ 0.02782	\$ 86,002	\$ 71,767	15	3,633,831	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 86,921.24	\$ 59,449.48
16	2,567,048	\$ 0.0337	\$ 0.02810	\$ 86,428	\$ 72,122	16	3,615,662	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 86,486.63	\$ 59,152.23
17	2,554,213	\$ 0.0340	\$ 0.02838	\$ 86,855	\$ 72,479	17	3,597,584	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 86,054.20	\$ 58,856.47
18	2,541,442	\$ 0.0343	\$ 0.02866	\$ 87,285	\$ 72,838	18	3,579,596	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 85,623.93	\$ 58,562.19
19	2,528,735	\$ 0.0347	\$ 0.02895	\$ 87,717	\$ 73,199	19	3,561,698	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 85,195.81	\$ 58,269.38
20	2,516,091	\$ 0.0350	\$ 0.02924	\$ 88,152	\$ 73,561	20	3,543,889	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 84,769.83	\$ 57,978.03
Total Estimated Revenue (Nominal)				\$ 1,682,923	\$ 1,404,370	Total Estimated Revenue (Nominal)				\$ 1,778,825.90	\$ 1,216,621.73
Total Estimated Revenue (Present Value)				\$ 1,040,392	\$ 868,189	Total Estimated Revenue (Present Value)				\$ 1,117,291	\$ 764,167

Attachment 4 Sensitivity Analysis

Option 1 Lease Price, Guaranteed Production & \$1,000,000 in Unforeseen Interconnection Cost

HESP Solar						EZenergy & Standard Solar					
Year	Guaranteed Production (kWh)	Proposed Lease Payment \$/kWh	Proposed Lease Payment with \$1M in INX Cost \$/kWh	Estimated Revenue - Proposed Lease \$	Estimated Revenue - with \$1M in INX Cost \$	Year	Guaranteed Production (kWh)	Proposed Lease Payment \$/kWh	Proposed Lease Payment with \$1M in INX Cost \$/kWh	Estimated Revenue - Proposed Lease \$	Estimated Revenue - with \$1M in INX Cost \$
1	2,767,501	\$ 0.0290	\$ 0.01587	\$ 80,258	\$ 43,911	1	3,897,998	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 93,240.11	\$ 52,856.85
2	2,753,663	\$ 0.0293	\$ 0.01603	\$ 80,655	\$ 44,128	2	3,878,508	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 92,773.91	\$ 52,592.57
3	2,739,895	\$ 0.0296	\$ 0.01619	\$ 81,054	\$ 44,347	3	3,859,115	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 92,310.04	\$ 52,329.61
4	2,726,196	\$ 0.0299	\$ 0.01635	\$ 81,455	\$ 44,566	4	3,839,820	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 91,848.49	\$ 52,067.96
5	2,712,565	\$ 0.0302	\$ 0.01651	\$ 81,858	\$ 44,787	5	3,820,621	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 91,389.25	\$ 51,807.62
6	2,699,002	\$ 0.0305	\$ 0.01668	\$ 82,264	\$ 45,009	6	3,801,518	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 90,932.30	\$ 51,548.58
7	2,685,507	\$ 0.0308	\$ 0.01684	\$ 82,671	\$ 45,231	7	3,782,510	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 90,477.64	\$ 51,290.84
8	2,672,079	\$ 0.0311	\$ 0.01701	\$ 83,080	\$ 45,455	8	3,763,598	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 90,025.25	\$ 51,034.38
9	2,658,719	\$ 0.0314	\$ 0.01718	\$ 83,491	\$ 45,680	9	3,744,780	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 89,575.13	\$ 50,779.21
10	2,645,425	\$ 0.0317	\$ 0.01735	\$ 83,905	\$ 45,906	10	3,726,056	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 89,127.25	\$ 50,525.31
11	2,632,198	\$ 0.0320	\$ 0.01753	\$ 84,320	\$ 46,134	11	3,707,425	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 88,681.62	\$ 50,272.69
12	2,619,037	\$ 0.0324	\$ 0.01770	\$ 84,737	\$ 46,362	12	3,688,888	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 88,238.21	\$ 50,021.32
13	2,605,942	\$ 0.0327	\$ 0.01788	\$ 85,157	\$ 46,592	13	3,670,444	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 87,797.02	\$ 49,771.22
14	2,592,912	\$ 0.0330	\$ 0.01806	\$ 85,578	\$ 46,822	14	3,652,092	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 87,358.03	\$ 49,522.36
15	2,579,948	\$ 0.0333	\$ 0.01824	\$ 86,002	\$ 47,054	15	3,633,831	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 86,921.24	\$ 49,274.75
16	2,567,048	\$ 0.0337	\$ 0.01842	\$ 86,428	\$ 47,287	16	3,615,662	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 86,486.63	\$ 49,028.38
17	2,554,213	\$ 0.0340	\$ 0.01860	\$ 86,855	\$ 47,521	17	3,597,584	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 86,054.20	\$ 48,783.23
18	2,541,442	\$ 0.0343	\$ 0.01879	\$ 87,285	\$ 47,756	18	3,579,596	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 85,623.93	\$ 48,539.32
19	2,528,735	\$ 0.0347	\$ 0.01898	\$ 87,717	\$ 47,993	19	3,561,698	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 85,195.81	\$ 48,296.62
20	2,516,091	\$ 0.0350	\$ 0.01917	\$ 88,152	\$ 48,230	20	3,543,889	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01356	\$ 84,769.83	\$ 48,055.14
Total Estimated Revenue (Nominal)				\$ 1,682,923	\$ 920,771	Total Estimated Revenue (Nominal)				\$ 1,778,825.90	\$ 1,008,397.96
Total Estimated Revenue (Present Value)				\$ 1,040,392	\$ 569,226	Total Estimated Revenue (Present Value)				\$ 1,117,291	\$ 633,381

Option 1 Lease Price, Estimated Production & \$500,000 in Unforeseen Interconnection Cost

HESP Solar						EZenergy & Standard Solar					
Year	Estimated Production (kWh)	Proposed Lease Payment \$/kWh	Proposed Lease Payment with \$500K in INX Cost \$/kWh	Estimated Revenue - Proposed Lease \$	Estimated Revenue - with \$500K in INX Cost \$	Year	Estimated Production (kWh)	Proposed Lease Payment \$/kWh	Proposed Lease Payment with \$500K in INX Cost \$/kWh	Estimated Revenue - Proposed Lease \$	Estimated Revenue - with \$500K in INX Cost \$
1	3,075,002	\$ 0.0290	\$ 0.02420	\$ 89,175	\$ 74,415	1	4,331,109	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 103,600.13	\$ 70,856.94
2	3,059,627	\$ 0.0293	\$ 0.02444	\$ 89,616	\$ 74,783	2	4,309,453	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 103,082.13	\$ 70,502.66
3	3,044,329	\$ 0.0296	\$ 0.02469	\$ 90,060	\$ 75,154	3	4,287,906	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 102,566.72	\$ 70,150.15
4	3,029,107	\$ 0.0299	\$ 0.02493	\$ 90,506	\$ 75,526	4	4,266,467	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 102,053.88	\$ 69,799.39
5	3,013,962	\$ 0.0302	\$ 0.02518	\$ 90,954	\$ 75,899	5	4,245,134	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 101,543.61	\$ 69,450.40
6	2,998,892	\$ 0.0305	\$ 0.02543	\$ 91,404	\$ 76,275	6	4,223,909	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 101,035.89	\$ 69,103.15
7	2,983,897	\$ 0.0308	\$ 0.02569	\$ 91,857	\$ 76,653	7	4,202,789	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 100,530.72	\$ 68,757.63
8	2,968,978	\$ 0.0311	\$ 0.02595	\$ 92,311	\$ 77,032	8	4,181,775	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 100,028.06	\$ 68,413.84
9	2,954,133	\$ 0.0314	\$ 0.02621	\$ 92,768	\$ 77,413	9	4,160,866	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 99,527.92	\$ 68,071.77
10	2,939,362	\$ 0.0317	\$ 0.02647	\$ 93,227	\$ 77,797	10	4,140,062	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 99,030.28	\$ 67,731.41
11	2,924,666	\$ 0.0320	\$ 0.02673	\$ 93,689	\$ 78,182	11	4,119,362	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 98,535.13	\$ 67,392.76
12	2,910,042	\$ 0.0324	\$ 0.02700	\$ 94,153	\$ 78,569	12	4,098,765	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 98,042.45	\$ 67,055.79
13	2,895,492	\$ 0.0327	\$ 0.02727	\$ 94,619	\$ 78,958	13	4,078,271	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 97,552.24	\$ 66,720.51
14	2,881,015	\$ 0.0330	\$ 0.02754	\$ 95,087	\$ 79,348	14	4,057,880	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 97,064.48	\$ 66,386.91
15	2,866,609	\$ 0.0333	\$ 0.02782	\$ 95,558	\$ 79,741	15	4,037,590	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 96,579.16	\$ 66,054.98
16	2,852,276	\$ 0.0337	\$ 0.02810	\$ 96,031	\$ 80,136	16	4,017,402	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 96,096.26	\$ 65,724.70
17	2,838,015	\$ 0.0340	\$ 0.02838	\$ 96,506	\$ 80,533	17	3,997,315	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 95,615.78	\$ 65,396.08
18	2,823,825	\$ 0.0343	\$ 0.02866	\$ 96,984	\$ 80,931	18	3,977,329	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 95,137.70	\$ 65,069.10
19	2,809,706	\$ 0.0347	\$ 0.02895	\$ 97,464	\$ 81,332	19	3,957,442	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 94,662.01	\$ 64,743.75
20	2,795,657	\$ 0.0350	\$ 0.02924	\$ 97,946	\$ 81,734	20	3,937,655	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.01636	\$ 94,188.70	\$ 64,420.03
Total Estimated Revenue (Nominal)				\$ 1,869,914	\$ 1,560,411	Total Estimated Revenue (Nominal)				\$ 1,976,473.28	\$ 1,351,801.96
Total Estimated Revenue (Present Value)				\$ 1,155,991	\$ 964,655	Total Estimated Revenue (Present Value)				\$ 1,241,434	\$ 849,075

Community Solar Lease Price, Guaranteed Production & \$500,000 in Unforeseen Interconnection Cost

HESP Solar						EZnergy & Standard Solar					
Year	Guaranteed Production (kWh)	Proposed Lease Payment \$/kWh	Proposed Lease Payment with \$500K in INX Cost \$/kWh	Estimated Revenue - Proposed Lease \$	Estimated Revenue - with \$500K in INX Cost \$	Year	Guaranteed Production (kWh)	Proposed Lease Payment \$/kWh	Proposed Lease Payment with \$500K in INX Cost \$/kWh	Estimated Revenue - Proposed Lease \$	Estimated Revenue - with \$500K in INX Cost \$
1	2,767,501	\$ 0.0650	\$ 0.06020	\$ 179,888	\$ 166,604	1	3,897,998	\$ 0.0872	\$ 0.07964	\$ 339,905.43	\$ 310,436.56
2	2,753,663	\$ 0.0657	\$ 0.06080	\$ 180,778	\$ 167,428	2	3,878,508	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.07964	\$ 92,773.91	\$ 308,884.38
3	2,739,895	\$ 0.0663	\$ 0.06141	\$ 181,673	\$ 168,257	3	3,859,115	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.07964	\$ 92,310.04	\$ 307,339.96
4	2,726,196	\$ 0.0670	\$ 0.06202	\$ 182,572	\$ 169,090	4	3,839,820	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.07964	\$ 91,848.49	\$ 305,803.26
5	2,712,565	\$ 0.0676	\$ 0.06264	\$ 183,476	\$ 169,927	5	3,820,621	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.07964	\$ 91,389.25	\$ 304,274.24
6	2,699,002	\$ 0.0683	\$ 0.06327	\$ 184,384	\$ 170,768	6	3,801,518	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.07964	\$ 90,932.30	\$ 302,752.87
7	2,685,507	\$ 0.0690	\$ 0.06390	\$ 185,297	\$ 171,613	7	3,782,510	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.07964	\$ 90,477.64	\$ 301,239.10
8	2,672,079	\$ 0.0697	\$ 0.06454	\$ 186,214	\$ 172,463	8	3,763,598	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.07964	\$ 90,025.25	\$ 299,732.91
9	2,658,719	\$ 0.0704	\$ 0.06519	\$ 187,136	\$ 173,317	9	3,744,780	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.07964	\$ 89,575.13	\$ 298,234.24
10	2,645,425	\$ 0.0711	\$ 0.06584	\$ 188,062	\$ 174,174	10	3,726,056	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.07964	\$ 89,127.25	\$ 296,743.07
11	2,632,198	\$ 0.0718	\$ 0.06650	\$ 188,993	\$ 175,037	11	3,707,425	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.07964	\$ 88,681.62	\$ 295,259.36
12	2,619,037	\$ 0.0725	\$ 0.06716	\$ 189,929	\$ 175,903	12	3,688,888	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.07964	\$ 88,238.21	\$ 293,783.06
13	2,605,942	\$ 0.0732	\$ 0.06783	\$ 190,869	\$ 176,774	13	3,670,444	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.07964	\$ 87,797.02	\$ 292,314.15
14	2,592,912	\$ 0.0740	\$ 0.06851	\$ 191,813	\$ 177,649	14	3,652,092	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.07964	\$ 87,358.03	\$ 290,852.57
15	2,579,948	\$ 0.0747	\$ 0.06920	\$ 192,763	\$ 178,528	15	3,633,831	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.07964	\$ 86,921.24	\$ 289,398.31
16	2,567,048	\$ 0.0755	\$ 0.06989	\$ 193,717	\$ 179,412	16	3,615,662	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.07964	\$ 86,486.63	\$ 287,951.32
17	2,554,213	\$ 0.0762	\$ 0.07059	\$ 194,676	\$ 180,300	17	3,597,584	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.07964	\$ 86,054.20	\$ 286,511.56
18	2,541,442	\$ 0.0770	\$ 0.07130	\$ 195,640	\$ 181,192	18	3,579,596	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.07964	\$ 85,623.93	\$ 285,079.01
19	2,528,735	\$ 0.0777	\$ 0.07201	\$ 196,608	\$ 182,089	19	3,561,698	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.07964	\$ 85,195.81	\$ 283,653.61
20	2,516,091	\$ 0.0785	\$ 0.07273	\$ 197,581	\$ 182,991	20	3,543,889	\$ 0.0239	\$ 0.07964	\$ 84,769.83	\$ 282,235.34
Total Estimated Revenue (Nominal)				\$ 3,772,068	\$ 3,493,515	Total Estimated Revenue (Nominal)				\$ 2,025,491.22	\$ 5,922,478.89
Total Estimated Revenue (Present Value)				\$ 2,331,912	\$ 2,159,710	Total Estimated Revenue (Present Value)				\$ 1,352,210	\$ 3,719,943

