REDACTED

RFX – Doc [redacted]
[Environmental Affairs – "Of Choice Remediation Program"]

PO/Contract Number	Multiple
Successful Bidder	Multiple
Budget/NTX Amount	$[redacted]

Business Context/Scope of Work Summary:

A. Business Context

- Three-year cover agreements for remediation services to support the Environmental Affairs Department (EAD) Remediation group. The agreements will have the option for two 1-year extensions, rates are held for the 3-year period and subject to re-evaluation upon further extension.
- No current agreements exist for direct contract with remediations contracts. Previous remediation services were performed using standalone agreements.
- Spend projections for the next 3-year period are estimated at [redacted] estimated in direct awarded (smaller, low risk) work (<2[redacted]), and [redacted]M projected in fixed price bid work (larger, higher risk).
- Issue cover agreements to the successful full services vendors to ensure adequate coverage in all Eversource operational regions.

B. Scope of Work

The ERG is seeking Environmental Remediation Contractors (Contractors) to provide soil and groundwater site remediation services related to; soil and waste management, environmental demolition, former Manufactured Gas Plant (MGP) remediation, water management, wetland remediation, and site improvements incidental to a hazardous material recovery. The categories of anticipated Work under this contract are as follows:

Types of services that are expected are as follows:

- Soil & Waste Management
- Environmental Demolitions, Decontamination, and Dismantling of Substations, Controls Houses and Other facilities
- Former Manufactured Gas Plants (MGP) Remediation
- Water Management
- Waterways and Wetlands Remediation
- Site Improvements Incidental to Remediation

Procurement/Contracting Approach:

Creation of an "Of Choice" Program –
Due to anticipated amount of work needing to be performed during the 3-year term of this contract, Procurement and EAD determined an "Of Choice" program would be the best tool to execute the work. Similar to the Constructor of Choice program, suppliers would be evaluated on a technical and commercial basis to develop a pool of suppliers where low dollar/low risk projects under $250K could be direct assigned on a T&M basis and higher dollar/higher risk projects over $250K would be competitively bid on a lump sum basis.

- Technical Qualification/Evaluation: (30%)
    i. Bidders evaluated on qualifications as remediation contractors, examples of previous experiences, equipment list, capabilities, and a company statement of qualifications.
- Commercial Evaluation: (70%)
    i. Key Time and Materials Rates – A comprehensive Schedule of Values was provided by the bidders and the 30 most anticipated rate classifications for labor, equipment, and materials were selected for evaluation
    ii. Scenario Pricing – Worked with the ERG Project Team to create pricing scenarios using the rates provided in the comprehensive pricing sheet, to see what "typical" small jobs and "typical" large jobs would be valued at – these values were evaluated for all bidders.
    iii. Percentage Mark-up – Bidders were evaluated on Subcontractor Mark up, Equipment and Material Mark-up, and Disposal Mark up.

Bidders with the highest composite technical and commercial evaluation were selected for the smaller/low risk/direct assign work on a T&M basis ("small jobs"). The team worked to ensure an adequate number of suppliers were available to support all regions within the Eversource service territory.

- Under $250K, direct assign, T&M
- Projects under $250K, but with disposal costs over $100K shall be competitively bid (this is due to so many unknown waste streams on these projects, obtaining rates for disposal facilities would be a fruitless effort – the project team agreed to obtain a competitive markup percentage for disposal).

Bidders with the highest technical score (proved capable of supporting more complex, larger, projects, such as MGP sites) were selected for the larger/high risk/competitive bid work on a lump sum basis ("large jobs"). The team worked to ensure an adequate number of suppliers were available to support all regions within the Eversource service territory.

- Over $250K, competitive bid, lump sum

REDACTED

General/Special Terms and Conditions:

Cover Agreement with Waste Management GTC and Pricing Schedule for Field Services.

The Environmental Project Team does not anticipate and of the work to be performed in the next 3 years to require Liquidated Damages, Bonds, or additional special terms. However, should they be required, competitively bid project still reserve the right to imposed special terms implicated on a Work Release.

Bid List:

Bidder Name	Bids Received For/Interest in Performing:		Negotiate	Award
	"Small Jobs"	"Large Jobs"		
[redacted]	Decline	Decline		
	Yes	Yes		
	No	Yes	X	X
	Yes	Yes	X	X
	No	Yes	X	X
	Yes	Yes	X	On hold due to Safety Score*
	Decline	Decline		
	Decline	Decline		
	Yes	Yes	X	X
	Yes	Yes	X	X
	Yes	Yes		
	Yes	Yes		
	Yes	Yes	X	X
	Yes	No		
	Yes	Yes	X	X
	Yes	Yes	X	X
	Yes	Yes	X	X
	Yes	Yes	X	X
	Yes	Yes		

* Upon initial receipt of the bid, [redacted] was at a passing grade. Prior to award, [redacted] safety score dropped to a failing grade. Contract award is being held until [redacted] has a passing safety score.

REDACTED

Procurement Milestones:

MILESTONE	DATE
RFX is issued	**12/31/18**
Pre-bid Conference Call	**1/11/19**
RFX is closed	**2/8/19**
Preliminary Bid Evaluation is complete	**3/29/19**
Preliminary Recommendation approved by Procurement Manager	**3/29/19**
Meeting with EAD Management and [redacted] to Recommend Contractors for Negotiation and Award	**4/17/19**
Subsidiary Board Approval	**6/18/19**
Contract Award	**7/1/19**

RFP/Project Team:

DEPARTMENT	NAME
Procurement	[redacted]
EAD Project Team	
EAD Remediation Manager	

REDACTED

Preliminary / Final Pricing:
See Appendix II

Evaluation Criteria:
The commercial/technical weightings used are 70%/30%. Refer to Appendix II for bid evaluation criteria and bid evaluation details.

Evaluation Results:
"Small Jobs"



REDACTED

"Large Jobs"



Award Recommendation:

After performing a thorough review of all of the proposals submitted in response to this RFx, and after having accounted for any selected options, contingencies, pricing adjustments after all post-bid discussions, the following bidders are recommended for contract award:

"Small Jobs"

- [redacted]

"Large Jobs"

- [redacted]

Remediation Services - Small Projects
Doc4542652054
SMALL PROJECT BID EVALUATION

Final 9-18-24

Contractor Name:		[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]

BIDDERS MUST ATTAIN A "PASS" RATING IN SAFETY
Note: A Pass/Fail is given for the overall safety category (not each individual question)

Bidder Meets Safety Requirements as set forth by the Safety Department (Note: evaluated by XXXX)	PASS/FAIL	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Provide EMR rates, OSHA 300a forms and list any OSHA citations and environmental notices of violations for the past 3 years. Or if you are connected to the Eversource ISNetworld Network confirm they have been provided there or approved in ISNetworld														
Provide a copy of your health and safety plan.														
Please provide resumes for your company's Safety Officers														
PASS/FAIL		PASS	PASS	Conditional Pass	PASS	PASS	PASS	PASS	PASS	Conditional Pass	PASS	PASS	PASS	PASS

TECHNICAL (NON-PRICING) EVALUATION OF BIDDERS

Technical (Non-Pricing) Evaluation Factor	Weighted Factor	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
General Company Overview (See "Technical Eval" tab)	35%	4.0	4.0	3.3	2.5	3.3	3.8	3.5	3.3	3.0	5.0	3.3	4.0	3.0
Soil & Waste (See "Technical Eval" tab)	25%	3.5	4.0	3.5	2.8	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.5
Env Demo/CH/Facilities (See "Technical Eval" tab)	15%	3.0	4.0	2.5	2.0	3.5	2.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	3.0	2.3
MGP (See "Technical Eval" tab)	10%	3.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	4.0	2.0	4.0	2.3
Water Mgmt (See "Technical Eval" tab)	2%	3.0	4.0	3.5	3.0	3.5	2.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.5
Waterway/Wetlands (See "Technical Eval" tab)	1%	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.8	2.5	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.8
Site Improvements (See "Technical Eval" tab)	2%	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.0
General Quantitative Questions (See "Technical Eval" tab)	10%	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.5
Technical (Non-Pricing) Score	100%	**3.5**	**4.0**	**3.0**	**2.5**	**3.1**	**2.9**	**3.1**	**3.1**	**3.5**	**4.3**	**3.0**	**3.7**	**3.0**

COMMERCIAL (PRICING) EVALUATION OF BIDDERS

Commercial (Pricing) Evaluation Factor	Weighted Factor	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Key T&M Rates	50%	4.2	1.5	3.2	-0.3	3.7	5.0	-0.4	2.7	0.8	2.1	4.5	1.3	2.2
Scenarios	25%	4.9	0.1	2.0	0.1	3.6	5.0	0.1	0.8	3.5	2.6	-1.2	2.2	2.8
Mark-ups	15%	1.3	2.3	2.0	2.0	1.3	2.0	3.3	2.0	1.3	2.7	1.3	1.7	2.0
Commercial Exceptions	10%	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Commercial (Pricing) Score	100%	**4.0**	**1.6**	**2.9**	**0.7**	**3.5**	**4.5**	**0.8**	**2.2**	**2.0**	**2.6**	**2.6**	**1.9**	**2.6**

STEWARDSHIP EVALUATION OF BIDDERS

Stewardship Evaluation Factor	Weighted Factor	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Sustainability	50%	5.0	5.0	0.0	2.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	2.0	5.0	5.0
Diversity	50%	1.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	1.0	5.0
Stewardship Score	100%	**3.0**	**5.0**	**0.5**	**1.5**	**3.0**	**1.0**	**1.0**	**3.0**	**5.0**	**3.5**	**1.0**	**3.0**	**5.0**

COMBINED EVALUATION OF BIDDERS

Combined Ranking	Weighted Factor	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Technical (Non Pricing) Score	30%	3.5	4.0	3.0	2.5	3.1	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.5	4.3	3.0	3.7	3.0
Commercial (Pricing) Score	65%	4.0	1.6	2.9	0.7	3.5	4.5	0.8	2.2	2.0	2.6	2.6	1.9	2.6
Stewardship Score	5%	3.0	5.0	0.5	1.5	3.0	1.0	1.0	3.0	5.0	3.5	1.0	3.0	5.0
Combined / Total Evaluated Score	100%	**3.8**	**2.5**	**2.8**	**1.3**	**3.3**	**3.9**	**1.5**	**2.5**	**2.6**	**3.1**	**2.7**	**2.5**	**2.8**
	RANK	**2**	**10**	**6**	**13**	**3**	**1**	**12**	**11**	**8**	**4**	**7**	**9**	**5**

[redacted]

Reviewed and Evaluated By:
Procurement - [redacted]
Technical Evaluation: [redacted]

Notes:
Orange colored cells are entered manually by the bid evaluation team
Diversity Score- See Diversity tab
Sustainability Score - Please refer to the results in Ariba
Technical Scores - A score comment is required for all technical scores more than 4 or 2 and less
Safety Scores - Please refer to the results in ISNetworld or as manually evaluated by Safety.

Evaluation Criteria were reviewed and bidders rated on a scale of 1-5 , as shown below:
1 - Unacceptable
2 - Below Average
3 - Average
4 - Above Average
5 - Far Above Average

Sustainability (Ariba Scores):
[redacted]

T&C Exceptions:
[redacted]

Safety
[redacted]

Remediation Services - Large Projects
Doc4542652054
LARGE PROJECT BID EVALUATION

Final 9-18-24

Contractor Name:		[redacted]

BIDDERS MUST ATTAIN A "PASS" RATING IN SAFETY
Note: A Pass/Fail is given for the overall safety category (not each individual question)

Bidder Meets Safety Requirements as set forth by the Safety Department (Note: evaluated by XXXX)	PASS/FAIL	[redacted]
Provide EMR rates, OSHA 300a forms and list any OSHA citations and environmental notices of violations for the past 3 years. Or if you are connected to the Eversource ISNetworld Network confirm they have been provided there or approved in ISNetworld		
Provide a copy of your health and safety plan.		
Please provide resumes for your company's Safety Officers		
PASS/FAIL		PASS | PASS | Conditional Pass | PASS | PASS | PASS | PASS | Conditional Pass | PASS | PASS | PASS | PASS

TECHNICAL (NON-PRICING) EVALUATION OF BIDDERS

Technical (Non-Pricing) Evaluation Factor	Weighted Factor	[redacted]
General Company Overview (See "Technical Eval" tab)	35%	4.0 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 3.0
Soil & Waste (See "Technical Eval" tab)	15%	3.5 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5
Env Demo/CH/Facilities (See "Technical Eval" tab)	10%	3.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.3
MGP (See "Technical Eval" tab)	15%	3.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 2.3
Water Mgmt (See "Technical Eval" tab)	5%	3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0
Waterway/Wetlands (See "Technical Eval" tab)	5%	3.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 2.5
Site Improvements (See "Technical Eval" tab)	5%	3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0
General Quantitative Questions (See "Technical Eval" tab)	10%	3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.5
Technical (Non-Pricing) Score	100%	**3.4 | 3.9 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 4.3 | 2.9 | 3.7 | 2.9**

COMMERCIAL (PRICING) EVALUATION OF BIDDERS

Commercial (Pricing) Evaluation Factor	Weighted Factor	[redacted]
Key T&M Rates	50%	4.2 | 1.5 | 3.2 | -0.3 | 3.7 | 5.0 | 2.7 | 0.8 | 2.1 | 4.5 | 1.3 | 2.2
Scenarios	25%	4.1 | 0.5 | 2.0 | -0.8 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 4.2 | 2.2 | 1.3 | 1.0
Mark-ups	15%	1.3 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 2.0
Commercial Exceptions	10%	5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0
Commercial (Pricing) Score	100%	**3.8 | 1.7 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 3.6 | 4.6 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 1.7 | 2.1**

STEWARDSHIP EVALUATION OF BIDDERS

Stewardship Evaluation Factor	Weighted Factor	[redacted]
Sustainability	50%	5.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 5.0
Diversity	50%	1.0 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 5.0
Stewardship Score	100%	**3.0 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 5.0**

COMBINED EVALUATION OF BIDDERS

Combined Ranking	Weighted Factor	[redacted]
Technical (Non Pricing) Score	30%	3.4 | 3.9 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 4.3 | 2.9 | 3.7 | 2.9
Commercial (Pricing) Score	65%	3.8 | 1.7 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 3.6 | 4.6 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 1.7 | 2.1
Stewardship Score	5%	3.0 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 5.0
Combined / Total Evaluated Score	100%	**3.6 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 1.1 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 2.4 | 2.5**
	RANK	**2 | 8 | 6 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 11 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 9**

- [redacted]

Reviewed and Evaluated By:
Procurement - [redacted]
Technical Evaluation: [redacted]

Notes:
Orange colored cells are entered manually by the bid evaluation team
Diversity Score- See Diversity tab
Sustainability Score - Please refer to the results in Ariba
Technical Scores - A score comment is required for all technical scores more than 4 or 2 and less
Safety Scores - Please refer to the results in ISNetworld or as manually evaluated by Safety.

Evaluation Criteria were reviewed and bidders rated on a scale of 1-5 , as shown below:
1 - Unacceptable
2 - Below Average
3 - Average
4 - Above Average
5 - Far Above Average

Sustainability (Ariba Scores):
[redacted]

T&C Exceptions:
[redacted]

Safety
[redacted]

Environmental - Doc4542652054
Remediation Services
Key T&M Rates

Key Rates	Weighted														Averages
Labor Classifications (60%)	**Factor**														
Field Technician (Laborer)*		[redacted]													
Driver*															
Equipment Operator*															
Foreman*															
Average															
Normalized	***60***														
Equipment, Material, and Containers - daily (40%)															
6 wheel Dump Truck*															
Roll-off truck **															
Vacuum Truck , Min. 3000 gal. w/ accessories * all types															
Bob-Cat /Skid Steer w/broom sweeper attach. or equiv.**															
Small Excavator* <30K lb (80 - 125 hp)															
Medium Excavator * 30K -50K lb (148-268 hp))															
Excavator Hammer attachment															
Box Truck w/ lift-gate >20' *															
Stake Body/Utility Truck/Rack Truck															
Frac Tank - daily															
3/4" Crushed Stone															
55-gal steel drum															
Roll - Off Container - 30 yard (include liner, bows, and tarp)															
Average															
Normalized	***40***														
Key Rates Score															

Average Score - for evaluation purposes only
Calculated Score
Daily (8 hours)
Weekly (5 days)
Monthly (20 days)
Daily rates only (must charge daily rate even if only needed for a couple of hours)
No Daily rates (multiplied hourly by 8)

REDACTED

RFX –Doc1968996784
[Environmental Remediation/Berlin Settling Basin Remediation Project]

PO/Contract Number	CW2265788, 10966184
Successful Bidder	[redacted]
PO Amount	[redacted]
Contract Amount	[redacted]
Budget/NTX Amount	[redacted]

Business Context/Scope of Work Summary:

Environmental Remediation is required on the Eversource Berlin Campus in Connecticut. PCB impacted material has been detected in the Berlin Storm Water Settling Basin, impact levels in excess of 50 PPM. Eversource has been coordinating with the municipal, state and federal agencies to take the necessary measures to excavate and dispose of all PCB impacted material more than 10 PPM. Material which is less than 10 PPM can be consolidated and capped under a layer of non-polluted material to create a barrier beneath the clean top soil.

Due to the high dollar cost associated with the project, an RFP is required to solicit the services of an Eversource approved Environmental Remediation Contractor.

Schedule:
NTP: 11/1/19
Mobilization: 11/4/19
Pre-submittals and General Conditions: 11/1/19-12/3/19
Phase 3 Remediation: 12/3/19 - 12/31/19
Phase 2, 4, and 5 Remediation: 1/2/20 – 3/16/20
Demobilization: 3/30/20

Procurement/Contracting Approach:

The Berlin Settling Basin Remediation Project was bid on a combination of Lump Sum items, as well as Unit Price items. Items which could have a pre-established quantity or duration have been bid as Lump Sum, items with uncertain quantities have been bid on a Unit Price Basis due to the uncertain volumes of impacted materials for excavation and disposal.

The selected bidders for this RFP are all approved Environmental Remediation Contractors. Contract for the successful bidder will be a Work Release from the Cover Agreement for Environmental Remediation Services.

General/Special Terms and Conditions:
All the selected bidders are part of the "of Choice" Environmental Remediation Program, with negotiated T&M pricing schedules & cost-plus adders for Out of Scope Work.

The Cover Agreement for Environmental Remediation Services has pre-negotiated GTC's, awarded bidder will received a Work Release referencing the Cover Agreement's pricing schedule and GTC's.

Risks and Mitigation

Bid List:

BIDDER NAME	BID RECEIVED	SHORTLIST	AWARD
[redacted]	X	X	
	X	X	
	X	X	X
	X		

REDACTED

Procurement Milestones:

MILESTONE	DATE
RFX is issued	9/16/19
RFX is closed	10/7/19
Preliminary Bid Evaluation is complete	10/10/19
Clarified bids received	10/15/19
Negotiations/Best and Final is complete	10/17/19
Final Bid Evaluation is complete	10/21/19
MR/Requisition is approved	10/29/19
PO/Contract Award	10/31/19

RFP/Project Team:

DEPARTMENT	NAME
Procurement	[redacted]
Project Manager	
Business Unit Requester	

Preliminary / Final Pricing:
See Appendix II

Evaluation Criteria:
The commercial/technical weightings used are 70%/30%. Refer to Appendix II for bid evaluation criteria and bid evaluation details.

No alterations were made to the formatting of the "of Choice" bid evaluation template.

Evaluation Results:

Initial

CONFIDENTIAL

Berlin Settling Basin Remediation Project
Doc#1968996784 - RFP

Eversource Energy
Procurement
Of Choice Bid Evaluation Summary

Commercial 70% Score = 1 (low) to 5 (high)

Evaluation Category	Sub Category	Weight (Sub Cat.)	Weight	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score
Pricing			94%								
	Unit Price (Lump Sum)	100%		4.44	4.17	5.00	4.70	4.52	4.25	4.63	4.35
Non Pricing			6%	$2,553,409.00		$2,296,385.00		$2,514,553.30		$2,467,500.00	
	Diversity	50%		5	0.15	2	0.06	5	0.15	5	0.15
	Sustainability	50%		3.5	0.11	2.25	0.07	3.00	0.09	4.00	0.12
			100%								
	Total For Commercial ---------->				4.43		4.83		4.49		4.62

Technical 30%

Evaluation Category	Sub Category	Weight (sub Cat)	Weight	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score
Technical			80%								
	Performance on Past Projects - last 5 years	25%		5	1.00	4	0.80	5	1.00	3.5	0.70
	Technical Approach/Project Execution Plan	25%		5	1.00	3.5	0.70	4	0.80	3	0.60
	Project Team	25%		4	0.80	4	0.80	4	0.80	4	0.80
	Ability to Meet the Schedule	25%		4	0.80	3	0.60	5	1.00	1	0.20
Safety & Env			20%								
	ISN Safety Score	100%		4.35	0.87	5	1.00	4.5	0.90	4.75	0.95
			100%								
	Total for Technical ---------->				4.47		3.90		4.50		3.25
	Total For Bid Evaluation				**4.44**		**4.55**		**4.50**		**4.21**

Entered Manually by Bid Evaluation Team

REDACTED

[redacted]

Clarified

CONFIDENTIAL

Berlin Settling Basin Remediation Project
Doc#1968996784 - RFP

Eversource Energy
Procurement
Of Choice Bid Evaluation Summary

Commercial 70% Score = 1 (low) to 5 (high)

Evaluation Category	Sub Category	Weight (Sub Cat.)	Weight	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score
Pricing			94%						
	Unit Price (Lump Sum)	100%		4.83	4.35	5.00	4.70	4.42	4.16
Non Pricing			6%	$2,517,400.00		$2,344,850.00		$2,614,603.00	
	Diversity	50%		5	0.15	2	0.06	5	0.15
	Sustainability	50%		3.5	0.11	2.25	0.07	3.00	0.09
			100%						
	Total For Commercial ---------->				4.61		4.83		4.40

Technical 30%

Evaluation Category	Sub Category	Weight (sub Cat)	Weight	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score
Technical			80%						
	Performance on Past Projects - last 5 years	25%		5	1.00	4	0.80	5	1.00
	Technical Approach/Project Execution Plan	25%		5	1.00	3.5	0.70	4	0.80
	Project Team	25%		4	0.80	4	0.80	4	0.80
	Ability to Meet the Schedule	25%		4	0.80	3	0.60	5	1.00
Safety & Env			20%						
	ISN Safety Score	100%		4.35	0.87	5	1.00	4.5	0.90
			100%						
	Total for Technical ---------->				4.47		3.90		4.50
	Total For Bid Evaluation				**4.57**		**4.55**		**4.43**
	Entered Manually by Bid Evaluation Team								

Clarified bid reflects inclusion of [redacted]

Final

REDACTED

[redacted] [redacted]

CONFIDENTIAL

Berlin Settling Basin Remediation Project
Doc#1968996784 - RFP

Eversource Energy
Procurement
Of Choice Bid Evaluation Summary

Commercial 70% Score = 1 (low) to 5 (high) [redacted]

Evaluation Category	Sub Category	Weight (Sub Cat.)	Weight	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score
Pricing			94%						
	Unit Price (Lump Sum)	100%		4.68	4.31	4.64	4.36	5.00	4.70
Non Pricing			6%	$ 2,517,400.00		$ 2,492,800.00		$ 2,324,025.00	
	Diversity	50%		5	0.15	2	0.06	5	0.15
	Sustainability	50%		3.5	0.11	2.25	0.07	3.00	0.09
			100%						
	Total For Commercial ---------->				4.56		4.49		4.94

Technical 30% [redacted]

Evaluation Category	Sub Category	Weight (sub Cat)	Weight	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score
Technical			80%						
	Performance on Past Projects - last 5 years	25%		5	1.00	4	0.80	5	1.00
	Technical Approach/Project Execution Plan	25%		5	1.00	3.5	0.70	4	0.80
	Project Team	25%		4	0.80	4	0.80	4	0.80
	Ability to Meet the Schedule	25%		4	0.80	3	0.60	5	1.00
Safety & Env			20%						
	ISN Safety Score	100%		4.35	0.87	5	1.00	4.5	0.90
			100%						
	Total for Technical ---------->				4.47		3.90		4.50
	Total For Bid Evaluation				**4.54**		**4.31**		**4.81**
	Entered Manually by Bid Evaluation Team								

[redacted]

Award Recommendation:
After performing a thorough review of all of the proposals submitted in response to this RFx, and after having accounted for any selected options, contingencies, pricing adjustments after all post-bid discussions, [redacted] is recommended for contract award.

Significant Negotiation Issues:

See Appendix III

Savings:
See Appendix III

REDACTED

APPENDIX I
RISK AND MITIGATION

Risk	Potential (H/M/L)	Impact (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Phase 2 Remediation	M	M	[redacted]
Winter Conditions	L	L	
Minimum Load Fees	L	L	

APPENDIX II

BID EVALUATION

Preliminary / Final Pricing:

BIDDER	INITIAL AMOUNT	FINAL AMOUNT	COMMENTS
[redacted]			

Relative low degree of clarifications was required, pricing [redacted] from initial to final are resultant of [redacted]

Pricing Adjustments/Contingencies:

[redacted]

Bid Evaluation Matrix

[redacted]

REDACTED

RFX –Doc3111633954
Env. – Westside 7A Substation Control House Demolition

PO/Contract Number	
Successful Bidder	[redacted]
PO/Contract Amount	[redacted]
Budget/NTX Amount	

Scope of Work Summary:

Procurement/Contracting Approach:
Lump Sum work release to Cover Agreement for Remediation Construction Services.

General Terms and Conditions:
Terms and Conditions of [redacted] Cover Agreement for Remediation Construction Services.

Risks and Mitigation
Not applicable

Bid List:

BIDDER NAME	BID RECEIVED	SHORTLIST	AWARD
[redacted]			
	X		X

Procurement Milestones:

MILESTONE	DATE
RFX is issued	8/12/21
RFX is closed	9/7/21
Preliminary Recommendation approved by Procurement Manager	NA
Final Bid Evaluation is complete	9/22/21
MR/Requisition is approved	
PO/Contract Award	

RFP/Project Team:

DEPARTMENT	NAME
Procurement	[redacted]
Project Manager	
Environmental Team	

Preliminary / Final Pricing:

See Appendix II.

Evaluation Criteria:
The commercial/technical weightings used are 70%/30%. Refer to Appendix II for bid evaluation criteria and bid evaluation details.

REDACTED

Evaluation Results:

Commercial	70%	Score = 1 (low) to 5 (high)											
Evaluation Category	Sub Category	Weight (Sub Cat.)	Weight	Score	Computed Score	Weighted Score	Score	Computed Score	Weighted Score	Score	Computed Score	Weighted Score
Pricing			94%										
	Lump sum	100%		5.0	5.00	4.70							
				$ 353,665									
Non Pricing			6%										
	Diversity	50%		0.5	0.25	0.02							
	Sustainability	50%		2.3	1.13	0.07							
			100%										
	Total For Commercial ——————>					4.8							
Technical	30%	Score = 1 (low) to 5 (high)											
Evaluation Category	Sub Category	Weight (sub Cat)	Weight	Score	Computed Score	Weighted Score	Score	Computed Score	Weighted Score	Score	Computed Score	Weighted Score
Technical			80%										
	Performance on Past Eversource Projects - last 5 years	25%		3.0	0.75	0.60							
	Technical Approach/Project Execution Plan	25%		3.0	0.75	0.60							
	Projec Team	25%		3.0	0.75	0.60							
	Ability to Meet the Schedule	25%		4.0	1.00	0.80							
Safety			20%										
	ISNetworld Safety Score	100%		4.3	4.25	0.85							
			100%										
	Total for Technical ——————>					3.6							
	Total For Bid Evaluation					4.4							

Significant Negotiation Issues/Savings:
N/A

Award Recommendation:
After performing a thorough review of all of the proposals submitted in response to this RFx, and after having accounted for any selected options, pricing adjustments after all post-bid discussions, [redacted] is recommended for contract award.

Significant Negotiation Issues:
See Appendix III

Savings:
N/A

REDACTED

APPENDIX I
RISK AND MITIGATION

N/A

REDACTED

APPENDIX II

BID EVALUATION

Preliminary / Final Pricing:

BIDDER	INITIAL AMOUNT	FINAL AMOUNT	COMMENTS
[redacted]	[redacted]		

Pricing Adjustments/Contingencies:

N/A

Bid Evaluation Matrix

[redacted]

CONFIDENTIAL

Willimantic MGP Site Remediation and Restoration
Doc# - 3631497123

AGENTS: PLEASE PERFORM THE FOLLOWING TASKS PRIOR TO RFP CLOSING:

1. Review percentages highlighted in blue with business partners/PM's and agree upon final percentage
2. If Unit Rates will be evaluated, the unit rate evaluation strategy shall be established and agreed upon prior to bids closing (and documented on the "Cost, Savings, and Diversity" tab

Eversource Energy
Procurement
Of Choice Bid Evaluation Summary

Commercial 65%

Score = 1 (low) to 5 (high)

Evaluation Category	Sub Category	Weight (Sub Cat.)	Weight	Score	Computed Score	Weighted Score	Score	Computed Score	Weighted Score	Score	Computed Score	Weighted Score	Score	Computed Score	Weighted Score
Pricing			100%												
	Lump Sum	100%		4.4	4.35	4.35	3.6	3.59	3.59	5.0	5.00	5.00			
	Total For Commercial ---------->					4.4			3.6			5.0			

Technical 30%

Score = 1 (low) to 5 (high)

Evaluation Category	Sub Category	Weight (sub Cat)	Weight	Score	Computed Score	Weighted Score	Score	Computed Score	Weighted Score	Score	Computed Score	Weighted Score	Score	Computed Score	Weighted Score
Technical			80%												
	Experience	40%		4.0	1.60	1.28	3.5	1.40	1.12	3.0	1.20	0.96			
	Technical Approach/Project Execution Plan	30%		3.0	0.90	0.72	4.0	1.20	0.96	5.0	1.50	1.20			
	Project Team, including Subcontractors	20%		3.5	0.70	0.56	3.0	0.60	0.48	3.3	0.65	0.52			
	Ability to Meet the Schedule	10%		4.0	0.40	0.32	3.0	0.30	0.24	3.5	0.35	0.28			
Safety			20%												
	ISNetworld Safety Score	100%		4.6	4.55	0.91	5.0	5.00	1.00	5.0	5.00	1.00			
			100%												
	Total for Technical ---------->					3.8			3.8			4.0			

Stewardship 5%

Score = 1 (low) to 5 (high)

Evaluation Category	Sub Category	Weight (sub Cat)	Weight	Score	Computed Score	Weighted Score	Score	Computed Score	Weighted Score	Score	Computed Score	Weighted Score	Score	Computed Score	Weighted Score
			100%												
	Sustainability	50%		1.3	0.65	0.65	5.0	2.50	2.50	5.0	2.50	2.50			
	Diversity	50%		5.0	2.50	2.50	1.0	0.50	0.50	1.0	0.50	0.50			
	Total For Stewardship ---------->					3.2			3.0			3.0			

Total For Bid Evaluation	4.1		3.6		4.6		

Evaluation Template Revision Date: 05/11/22

INSTRUCTIONS: Orange colored cells are entered manually by the bid evaluation team
Diversity Score- Score can be entered as 0 for non-diverse and 5 for diverse unless supplier group is submitting tier 2 diversity spend. If supplier is submitting tier 2, diversity score is to be entered in 0-100 scale for percentage of tier 2 diverse spend.
Sustainability Score - Please refer to the results of the Annual Sustainbility RFI
Technical Scores - A score comment is required for all technical scores more than 4 or 2 and less
Safety Scores - Please refer to the results of the Semi Annual Safety Report from ISNetworld. A score comment is required for any adjustments to the ISNetworld Safety Score
Note - If Sustainabilitiy and/or Safety scores are not available in annual or semi annual reports, please refer to the specific RFP for responses and ISNetworld

Evaluation Notes:

[redacted]

CONFIDENTIAL

Environmental - Overflow Contaminated Material Disposal

Doc# - 3853438621

AGENTS: PLEASE PERFORM THE FOLLOWING TASKS PRIOR TO RFP CLOSING:

1. Review percentages highlighted in blue with business partners/PM's and agree upon final percentage
2. If Unit Rates will be evaluated, the unit rate evaluation strategy shall be established and agreed upon prior to bids closing (and documented on the "Cost, Savings, and Diversity" tab

Eversource Energy
Procurement
Of Choice Bid Evaluation Summary

Commercial 65%

Score = 1 (low) to 5 (high)

Evaluation Category	Sub Category	Weight (Sub Cat.)	Weight	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score
Pricing			100%															
	Time & Materials	100%		0.0	0.00	0.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	2.7	2.74	2.74	0.9	0.92	0.92	0.0	0.00	0.00
	Total For Commercial ---------->					0.0			5.0			2.7			0.9			0.0

Technical 30%

Score = 1 (low) to 5 (high)

Evaluation Category	Sub Category	Weight (sub Cat)	Weight	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score
Technical			80%															
	Experience - 25%	25%		0.0	0.00	0.00	4.0	1.00	0.80	5.0	1.25	1.00	2.5	0.63	0.50	0.0	0.00	0.00
	Technical Approach- 25%	25%		0.0	0.00	0.00	3.0	0.75	0.60	5.0	1.25	1.00	3.0	0.75	0.60	0.0	0.00	0.00
	Team - 25%	25%		0.0	0.00	0.00	4.0	1.00	0.80	5.0	1.25	1.00	3.0	0.75	0.60	0.0	0.00	0.00
	Schedule - 25%	25%		0.0	0.00	0.00	5.0	1.25	1.00	5.0	1.25	1.00	4.0	1.00	0.80	0.0	0.00	0.00
Safety			20%															
	ISNetworld Safety Score	100%		4.0	4.00	0.80	4.9	4.90	0.98	5.0	5.00	1.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	5.0	5.00	1.00
			100%															
	Total for Technical ---------->					0.8			4.2			5.0			2.5			1.0

Stewardship 5%

Score = 1 (low) to 5 (high)

Evaluation Category	Sub Category	Weight (sub Cat)	Weight	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score
			100%															
	Sustainability	50%		0.0	0.00	0.00	1.3	0.65	0.65	1.3	0.65	0.65	1.3	0.65	0.65	0.0	0.00	0.00
	Diversity	50%		0.0	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	5.0	2.50	2.50	5.0	2.50	2.50	0.0	0.00	0.00
	Total For Stewardship ---------->					0.0			0.7			3.2			3.2			0.0

Total For Bid Evaluation						**0.2**			**4.5**			**3.4**			**1.3**			**0.3**

Evaluation Template Revision Date: 05/11/22

INSTRUCTIONS: Orange colored cells are entered manually by the bid evaluation team
Diversity Score- Score can be entered as 0 for non-diverse and 5 for diverse unless supplier group is submitting tier 2 diversity spend. If supplier is submitting tier 2, diversity score is to be entered in 0-100 scale for percentage of tier 2 diverse spend.
Sustainability Score - Please refer to the results of the Annual Sustainbility RFI
Technical Scores - A score comment is required for all technical scores more than 4 or 2 and less
Safety Scores - Please refer to the results of the Semi Annual Safety Report from ISNetworld. A score comment is required for any adjustments to the ISNetworld Safety Score
Note - If Sustainabiltiy and/or Safety scores are not available in annual or semi annual reports, please refer to the specific RFP for responses and ISNetworld

[redacted]

Printed 10/9/2026 1:41 PM

CONFIDENTIAL

Environmental - Overflow Contaminated Material Disposal (2023-2024 Future Disposal)
Doc# - 3853438621

AGENTS: PLEASE PERFORM THE FOLLOWING TASKS PRIOR TO RFP CLOSING:

1. Review percentages highlighted in blue with business partners/PM's and agree upon final percentage
2. If Unit Rates will be evaluated, the unit rate evaluation strategy shall be established and agreed upon prior to bids closing (and documented on the "Cost, Savings, and Diversity" tab

Eversource Energy
Procurement
Of Choice Bid Evaluation Summary

Commercial 65%

Score = 1 (low) to 5 (high)

Evaluation Category	Sub Category	Weight (Sub Cat.)	Weight	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score
Pricing			100%															
	Time & Materials	100%		0.0	0.00	0.00	-0.4	-0.44	-0.44	4.9	4.91	4.91	5.0	5.00	5.00	0.0	0.00	0.00
	Total For Commercial ---------->					0.0			-0.4			4.9			5.0			0.0

Technical 30%

Score = 1 (low) to 5 (high)

Evaluation Category	Sub Category	Weight (sub Cat)	Weight	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score
Technical			80%															
	Experience - 25%	25%		0.0	0.00	0.00	4.0	1.00	0.80	5.0	1.25	1.00	2.5	0.63	0.50	0.0	0.00	0.00
	Technical Approach- 25%	25%		0.0	0.00	0.00	3.0	0.75	0.60	5.0	1.25	1.00	3.0	0.75	0.60	0.0	0.00	0.00
	Team - 25%	25%		0.0	0.00	0.00	4.0	1.00	0.80	5.0	1.25	1.00	3.0	0.75	0.60	0.0	0.00	0.00
	Schedule - 25%	25%		0.0	0.00	0.00	5.0	1.25	1.00	5.0	1.25	1.00	4.0	1.00	0.80	0.0	0.00	0.00
Safety			20%															
	ISNetworld Safety Score	100%		0.0	0.00	0.00	4.9	4.90	0.98	5.0	5.00	1.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00
			100%															
	Total for Technical ---------->					0.0			4.2			5.0			2.5			0.0

Stewardship 5%

Score = 1 (low) to 5 (high)

Evaluation Category	Sub Category	Weight (sub Cat)	Weight	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score	[redacted] Score	[redacted] Computed Score	[redacted] Weighted Score
			100%															
	Sustainability	50%		0.0	0.00	0.00	1.3	0.65	0.65	1.3	0.65	0.65	1.3	0.65	0.65	0.0	0.00	0.00
	Diversity	50%		0.0	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	5.0	2.50	2.50	5.0	2.50	2.50	0.0	0.00	0.00
	Total For Stewardship ---------->					0.0			0.7			3.2			3.2			0.0

Total For Bid Evaluation						**0.0**			**1.0**			**4.8**			**4.0**			**0.0**

Evaluation Template Revision Date: 05/11/22

INSTRUCTIONS:
Orange colored cells are entered manually by the bid evaluation team
Diversity Score- Score can be entered as 0 for non-diverse and 5 for diverse unless supplier group is submitting tier 2 diversity spend. If supplier is submitting tier 2, diversity score is to be entered in 0-100 scale for percentage of tier 2 diverse spend.
Sustainability Score - Please refer to the results of the Annual Sustainbility RFI
Technical Scores - A score comment is required for all technical scores more than 4 or 2 and less
Safety Scores - Please refer to the results of the Semi Annual Safety Report from ISNetworld. A score comment is required for any adjustments to the ISNetworld Safety Score
Note - If Sustainabiltiy and/or Safety scores are not available in annual or semi annual reports, please refer to the specific RFP for responses and ISNetworld

[redacted]

Printed 10/9/2026 1:44 PM

REDACTED

RFX – Naugatuck 19K and Seymour 20F Remediation Projects

PO/Contract Number	13162035 Naugatuck, 13162044 Seymour CW2307976
Successful Bidder	[redacted]
PO/Contract Amount	[redacted]
Budget/NTX Amount	

Scope of Work Summary:
To provide remediation services to demolish and remove [redacted] from Substations at the Naugatuck 19K and Seymour 20F Substations.

Procurement/Contracting Approach:
Time and Material Not-to-Exceed project specific cover agreement for the project duration.

General Terms and Conditions:
Terms and Conditions of Strategic Environmental Services Remediation Cover Agreement dated July 1st, 2019.

Bid List:
[List the bidders that were invited to bid. Place a check mark in all applicable boxes]

BIDDER NAME	BID RECEIVED	SHORTLIST	AWARD
[redacted]	X		X

Preliminary / Final Pricing:
[List the initial and final amounts of the proposals received. Also provide brief comments (such as method used) to explain and differences between the initial and final amounts.]

BIDDER	INITIAL AMOUNT	FINAL AMOUNT	COMMENTS
[redacted]	[redacted]		

Bid Evaluation Matrix

[redacted]

Significant Negotiation Issues/Savings:
N/A

REDACTED

Award Recommendation:
After performing a thorough review of all of the proposals submitted in response to this RFx, and after having accounted for any selected options, pricing adjustments after all post-bid discussions; [redacted] is recommended for contract award.

REDACTED

RFX –Building Demolition and Remediation Services – Canton Substation
Doc3277783520

PO/Contract Number	13008207/CW2290606
Successful Bidder	[redacted]
PO/Contract Amount	[redacted]
Budget/NTX Amount	

Scope of Work Summary:
Building demolition and hazardous material abatement/disposal

Procurement/Contracting Approach:
Lump sum work release to Cover Agreement for Remediation Services.

General Terms and Conditions:
Terms and Conditions of [redacted] Cover Agreement for Environmental Consulting.

Bid List:

BIDDER NAME	BID RECEIVED	SHORTLIST	AWARD
[redacted]	X		
[redacted]			
[redacted]	X		X

Preliminary / Final Pricing:
[List the initial and final amounts of the proposals received. Also provide brief comments (such as method used) to explain and differences between the initial and final amounts.]

BIDDER	FINAL AMOUNT	COMMENTS
[redacted]		
[redacted]		

Bid Evaluation Matrix

[redacted]

Significant Negotiation Issues/Savings:
N/A

Award Recommendation:
After performing a thorough review of all of the proposals submitted in response to this RFx, and after having accounted for any selected options, pricing adjustments after all post-bid discussions; [redacted] is recommended for contract award.

NEEWS CONSTRUCTION RFP BID TAB

Environmental
Environmental Shelton Remedial Construction Services Doc # 4401780238

SUMMARY

I.a TECHNICAL (NON-PRICING) EVALUATION OF BIDDERS ATTAINING ALL "PASS" RATINGS

Below Criteria were reviewed and bidders rated on a scale of 1-10 , as shown below.

1-2 Unacceptable
3-4 Below Average
5-6 Average
7-8 Above Average
9-10 Far Above Average

	Technical (Non-Pricing) Evaluation Factor	Weighted Factor	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
1	Safety	10%	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
2	Technical Qualifications and Experience - Applicable to all bidders	90%	9.9	2.9	4.6	5.5
	Technical (Non-Pricing) Weighted Score	100%	9.9	3.6	5.2	6.0
	Technical (Non-Pricing) Normalized Score*		**10.0**	**3.6**	**5.2**	**6.0**

* Technical (Non-Pricing) Weighted Score is normalized such that the highest score is converted to a 10 and all other scores are decreased proportionately.

NEEWS CONSTRUCTION RFP BID TAB

SUMMARY

I.b COMPENSATION (PRICING) EVALUATION OF BIDDERS ATTAINING ALL "PASS" RATINGS

	Compensation (Pricing) Evaluation Factor	Weighted Factor	[redacted]			
3	Pricing (see "Price Summary" tab)	95%	8.82	9.58	6.09	6.77
4	Commercial Exceptions	5%	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
	Compensation (Pricing) Ranking*		**8.87**	**9.60**	**6.28**	**6.93**

1c. Stewardship

	Stewardship (Non-Pricing) Evaluation Factor	Weighted Factor	[redacted]			
5	Diversity	50%	10.00	2.00	4.00	2.00
6	Sustainabilty	50%	5.00	0.00	5.00	5.00
	Stewardship (Non-Pricing) Ranking		**7.50**	**1.00**	**4.50**	**3.50**

* Lowest evaluated bidder is a 10, a bidder higher than the lowest bidder by 5% is a 9, a bidder higher than the lowest bidder by 10% is an 8, etc.

I.d COMBINED EVALUATION OF BIDDERS ATTAINING ALL "PASS" RATINGS

	Combined Ranking	Weighted Factor	[redacted]			
7	Technical (Non-Pricing) Ranking	30%	10.00	3.63	5.22	6.02
8	Compensation (Pricing) Ranking	65%	8.87	9.60	6.28	6.93
9	Stewardship (Pricing) Ranking	5%	7.50	1.00	4.50	3.50
	Combined Ranking	100%	**9.14**	**7.38**	**5.88**	**6.49**

Notes:

T&C Exceptions:
None
Few
Moderate
Extreme

Diversity:
Diverse
Tier 2 Spend:
0-10%
11-20%
21-30%
31-40%
41-50%

Sustainability (Ariba Scores):

Safety:
ISNET Approved
Safety Department Approval if not in ISNET
ISNET Not Approved
Safety Department Not Approved if not in ISNET

[redacted]

REDACTED

RFP – Chesire Soil Disposal - Remediation

PO/Contract Number	13394431/ CW2335741
Successful Bidder	[redacted]
PO/Contract Amount	[redacted]
Budget/NTX Amount	

Scope of Work Summary:

Soil profiling, transportation and final disposal at the [redacted]. This was issued as a part of the remediation of choice contracts and utilizing those vendors. Along with an additional vendor [redacted].

Procurement/Contracting Approach:

Issue work release off "Of Choice Remediation Contract"

General Terms and Conditions:

General Terms and Conditions Waste Management

Bid List:
[List the bidders that were invited to bid. Place a check mark in all applicable boxes]

BIDDER NAME	BID RECEIVED	SHORTLIST	AWARD
[redacted]	X		
[redacted]	X		
[redacted]	X		X
[redacted]	X		

Preliminary / Final Pricing:
[List the initial and final amounts of the proposals received. Also provide brief comments (such as method used) to explain and differences between the initial and final amounts.]

BIDDER			
[redacted]	[redacted]		

Bid Evaluation Matrix

Attached to Ariba Internal Documents

Significant Negotiation Issues/Savings:

No Additional Savings off "Of Choice Agreement" Rates

Award Recommendation:
After performing a thorough review of all of the proposals submitted in response to this RFx, and after having accounted for any selected options, pricing adjustments after all post-bid discussions; [redacted] is recommended for contract award.