

ATTACHMENT 2C  
 PON 400-09-401  
 Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
1	City of Irvine	Financing Plan	6	6	8	6.666667
		Eligible Improvements	4	4	6	4.666667
		Loading Order	2	4	4	3.333333
		Home energy Ratings, Energy Audits, and Building Commissioning	4	6	6	5.333333
		Property Qualifications	4	4	6	4.666667
		Legal Considerations	4	4	6	4.666667
		Sustainability	4	4	5	4.333333
		Regional Approach	4	6	6	5.333333
		Verification of Energy Savings	4	6	5	5
		Participant Recruitment and communication	5	4	6	5
		Quality Assurance/Conformance with California Law	5	4	5	4.666667
		Team Organizational Structure	3	4	4	3.666667
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	4	4	5	13
		Energy, Peak Demand, and GHG Emissions Reductions	3	4	4	11
		Economically Disadvantaged Areas	0	0	0	0
		Time Criticality	0	0	0	0
		Program Transparency and Reporting	0	0	0	0
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	2	2	2	4
		Statement of Work	0	0	0	0
		Uses for Energy Commission Funds	6	4	6	5.333333
		Leveraged Funds/Resources	4	4	6	14
		Program Cost Effectiveness	0	0	0	0
		Program Budget	0	0	0	0
<b>Total:</b>		<b>92</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>104.6667</b>	

PON 400-09-401  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
2	County of Orange	Financing Plan	0	0	0	0
		Eligible Improvements	0	0	0	0
		Loading Order	0	0	0	0
		Home energy Ratings, Energy Audits, and Building Commissioning	0	0	0	0
		Property Qualifications	0	0	0	0
		Legal Considerations	0	0	0	0
		Sustainability	0	0	0	0
		Regional Approach	0	0	0	0
		Verification of Energy Savings	0	0	0	0
		Participant Recruitment and communication	0	0	0	0
		Quality Assurance/Conformance with California Law	0	0	0	0
		Team Organizational Structure	0	0	0	0
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	0	0	0	0
		Energy, Peak Demand, and GHG Emissions Reductions	0	0	0	0
		Economically Disadvantaged Areas	0	0	0	0
		Time Criticality	0	0	0	0
		Program Transparency and Reporting	0	0	0	0
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	0	0	0	0
		Statement of Work	0	0	0	0
		Uses for Energy Commission Funds	0	0	0	0
		Leveraged Funds/Resources	0	0	0	0
		Program Cost Effectiveness	0	0	0	0
Program Budget	0	0	0	0		
Total:		0	0	0	0	

PON 400-09-401  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
3	County of Marin, Community Develop Agency	Financing Plan	6	6	6	6
		Eligible Improvements	4	5	5	4.666667
		Loading Order	6	6	7	6.333333
		Home energy Ratings, Energy Audits, and Building Commissioning	5	6	6	5.666667
		Property Qualifications	5	5	5	5
		Legal Considerations	4	4	4	4
		Sustainability	6	6	6	6
		Regional Approach	5	5	5	5
		Verification of Energy Savings	5	5	5	5
		Participant Recruitment and communication	5	5	5	5
		Quality Assurance/Conformance with California Law	5	5	5	5
		Team Organizational Structure	7	6	5	6
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	6	5	18
		Energy, Peak Demand, and GHG Emissions Reductions	5	5	5	15
		Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	4	4	8.666667
		Time Criticality	4	4	4	4
		Program Transparency and Reporting	5	4	4	4.333333
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	6	5	4	10
		Statement of Work	7	5	5	22.666667
		Uses for Energy Commission Funds	5	5	5	5
		Leveraged Funds/Resources	4	4	4	12
		Program Cost Effectiveness	4	4	4	12
Program Budget	6	5	4	25		
Total:			217	197	187	200.3333

PON 400-09-401  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
4	Western Riverside Council of Governments	Financing Plan	0	0	0	0
		Eligible Improvements	0	0	0	0
		Loading Order	0	0	0	0
		Home energy Ratings, Energy Audits, and Building Commissioning	0	0	0	0
		Property Qualifications	0	0	0	0
		Legal Considerations	0	0	0	0
		Sustainability	0	0	0	0
		Regional Approach	0	0	0	0
		Verification of Energy Savings	0	0	0	0
		Participant Recruitment and communication	0	0	0	0
		Quality Assurance/Conformance with California Law	0	0	0	0
		Team Organizational Structure	0	0	0	0
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	0	0	0	0
		Energy, Peak Demand, and GHG Emissions Reductions	0	0	0	0
		Economically Disadvantaged Areas	0	0	0	0
		Time Criticality	0	0	0	0
		Program Transparency and Reporting	0	0	0	0
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	0	0	0	0
		Statement of Work	0	0	0	0
		Uses for Energy Commission Funds	0	0	0	0
		Leveraged Funds/Resources	0	0	0	0
Program Cost Effectiveness	0	0	0	0		
Program Budget	0	0	0	0		
Total:	0	0	0	0		

PON 400-09-401  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
5	City of Yucaipa	Financing Plan	5	7	7	6.333333
		Eligible Improvements	3	5	5	4.333333
		Loading Order	8	7	7	7.333333
		Home energy Ratings, Energy Audits, and Building Commissioning	3	5	5	4.333333
		Property Qualifications	8	8	8	8
		Legal Considerations	6	4	4	4.666667
		Sustainability	5	6	6	5.666667
		Regional Approach	4	4	4	4
		Verification of Energy Savings	6	7	7	6.666667
		Participant Recruitment and communication	8	6	6	6.666667
		Quality Assurance/Conformance with California Law	4	5	5	4.666667
		Team Organizational Structure	3	4	4	3.666667
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	4	3	2	9
		Energy, Peak Demand, and GHG Emissions Reductions	4	5	5	14
		Economically Disadvantaged Areas	6	5	5	10.666667
		Time Criticality	5	5	5	5
		Program Transparency and Reporting	4	5	5	4.666667
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	4	5	5	9.333333
		Statement of Work	5	5	5	20
		Uses for Energy Commission Funds	3	4	4	3.666667
		Leveraged Funds/Resources	6	5	5	16
Program Cost Effectiveness	2	3	2	7		
Program Budget	6	4	4	23.333333		
Total:			193	190	184	189

PON 400-09-401  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
6	Santa Barbara County	Financing Plan	8	7	8	7.666667
		Eligible Improvements	7	6	8	7
		Loading Order	5	5	6	5.333333
		Home energy Ratings, Energy Audits, and Building Commissioning	5	4	6	5
		Property Qualifications	6	6	8	6.666667
		Legal Considerations	6	6	8	6.666667
		Sustainability	6	5	7	6
		Regional Approach	6	7	8	7
		Verification of Energy Savings	6	4	5	5
		Participant Recruitment and communication	6	5	6	5.666667
		Quality Assurance/Conformance with California Law	5	4	6	5
		Team Organizational Structure	6	6	5	5.666667
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	5	5	17
		Energy, Peak Demand, and GHG Emissions Reductions	6	5	7	18
		Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	5	5	10
		Time Criticality	7	5	7	6.333333
		Program Transparency and Reporting	7	5	7	6.333333
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	6	6	7	12.666667
		Statement of Work	7	5	7	25.333333
		Uses for Energy Commission Funds	7	6	8	7
		Leveraged Funds/Resources	7	7	7	21
		Program Cost Effectiveness	6	5	7	18
		Program Budget	6	5	7	30
Total:			251	214	268	244.3333

PON 400-09-401  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
7	City of Los Angeles	Financing Plan	8	8	8	8
		Eligible Improvements	8	8	8	8
		Loading Order	7	7	8	7.333333
		Home energy Ratings, Energy Audits, and Building Commissioning	9	8	8	8.333333
		Property Qualifications	7	7	8	7.333333
		Legal Considerations	8	8	8	8
		Sustainability	6	7	8	7
		Regional Approach	7	7	7	7
		Verification of Energy Savings	8	8	7	7.666667
		Participant Recruitment and communication	6	7	7	6.666667
		Quality Assurance/Conformance with California Law	7	7	7	7
		Team Organizational Structure	5	7	7	6.333333
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	6	8	7	21
		Energy, Peak Demand, and GHG Emissions Reductions	6	7	7	20
		Economically Disadvantaged Areas	8	7	7	14.66667
		Time Criticality	7	7	7	7
		Program Transparency and Reporting	7	7	7	7
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	6	7	7	13.33333
		Statement of Work	6	4	6	21.33333
		Uses for Energy Commission Funds	8	8	8	8
		Leveraged Funds/Resources	7	8	8	23
		Program Cost Effectiveness	6	7	7	20
		Program Budget	8	7	7	36.66667
Total:		275	280	287	280.6667	

PON 400-09-401  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
8	City of San Bernardino	Financing Plan	0	0	0	0
		Eligible Improvements	0	0	0	0
		Loading Order	0	0	0	0
		Home energy Ratings, Energy Audits, and Building Commissioning	0	0	0	0
		Property Qualifications	0	0	0	0
		Legal Considerations	0	0	0	0
		Sustainability	0	0	0	0
		Regional Approach	0	0	0	0
		Verification of Energy Savings	0	0	0	0
		Participant Recruitment and communication	0	0	0	0
		Quality Assurance/Conformance with California Law	0	0	0	0
		Team Organizational Structure	0	0	0	0
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	0	0	0	0
		Energy, Peak Demand, and GHG Emissions Reductions	0	0	0	0
		Economically Disadvantaged Areas	0	0	0	0
		Time Criticality	0	0	0	0
		Program Transparency and Reporting	0	0	0	0
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	0	0	0	0
		Statement of Work	0	0	0	0
		Uses for Energy Commission Funds	0	0	0	0
		Leveraged Funds/Resources	0	0	0	0
Program Cost Effectiveness	0	0	0	0		
Program Budget	0	0	0	0		
Total:		0	0	0	0	



PON 400-09-401  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
9	Sacramento County	Financing Plan	9	8	8	8.333333
		Eligible Improvements	7	8	9	8
		Loading Order	8	8	8	8
		Home energy Ratings, Energy Audits, and Building Commissioning	8	8	8	8
		Property Qualifications	8	7	8	7.666667
		Legal Considerations	7	7	8	7.333333
		Sustainability	7	6	8	7
		Regional Approach	9	7	9	8.333333
		Verification of Energy Savings	8	7	8	7.666667
		Participant Recruitment and communication	8	7	8	7.666667
		Quality Assurance/Conformance with California Law	8	7	9	8
		Team Organizational Structure	8	8	8	8
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	7	8	22
		Energy, Peak Demand, and GHG Emissions Reductions	8	8	8	24
		Economically Disadvantaged Areas	8	8	7	15.333333
		Time Criticality	8	7	8	7.666667
		Program Transparency and Reporting	8	8	9	8.333333
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	9	8	8	16.666667
		Statement of Work	8	8	7	30.666667
		Uses for Energy Commission Funds	8	8	8	8
		Leveraged Funds/Resources	9	8	8	25
		Program Cost Effectiveness	8	7	7	22
Program Budget	8	7	7	36.666667		
Total:			321	300	310	310.3333

PON 400-09-401  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
10	County of Santa Clara	Financing Plan	5	6	6	5.666667
		Eligible Improvements	5	4	6	5
		Loading Order	5	6	7	6
		Home energy Ratings, Energy Audits, and Building Commissioning	4	4	5	4.333333
		Property Qualifications	6	6	8	6.666667
		Legal Considerations	5	6	7	6
		Sustainability	4	4	6	4.666667
		Regional Approach	5	4	6	5
		Verification of Energy Savings	5	4	5	4.666667
		Participant Recruitment and communication	3	4	5	4
		Quality Assurance/Conformance with California Law	4	4	5	4.333333
		Team Organizational Structure	4	4	5	4.333333
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	6	5	16
		Energy, Peak Demand, and GHG Emissions Reductions	3	3	5	11
		Economically Disadvantaged Areas	4	4	6	9.333333
		Time Criticality	5	5	7	5.666667
		Program Transparency and Reporting	5	4	6	5
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	4	5	8
		Statement of Work	6	4	6	21.333333
		Uses for Energy Commission Funds	6	5	5	5.333333
		Leveraged Funds/Resources	5	4	5	14
Program Cost Effectiveness	3	3	5	11		
Program Budget	3	4	5	20		
Total:			172	170	220	187.3333

PON 400-09-401  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
11	City & County of San Francisco	Financing Plan	8	8	9	8.333333
		Eligible Improvements	8	8	9	8.333333
		Loading Order	8	8	9	8.333333
		Home energy Ratings, Energy Audits, and Building Commissioning	8	8	9	8.333333
		Property Qualifications	7	7	9	7.666667
		Legal Considerations	8	7	9	8
		Sustainability	7	7	8	7.333333
		Regional Approach	8	7	7	7.333333
		Verification of Energy Savings	7	7	9	7.666667
		Participant Recruitment and communication	6	8	7	7
		Quality Assurance/Conformance with California Law	8	8	8	8
		Team Organizational Structure	7	6	8	7
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	8	8	9	25
		Energy, Peak Demand, and GHG Emissions Reductions	7	7	8	22
		Economically Disadvantaged Areas	8	8	7	15.333333
		Time Criticality	8	6	8	7.333333
		Program Transparency and Reporting	6	7	8	7
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	7	7	9	15.333333
		Statement of Work	6	7	6	25.333333
		Uses for Energy Commission Funds	9	8	9	8.666667
		Leveraged Funds/Resources	8	7	8	23
		Program Cost Effectiveness	7	7	8	22
		Program Budget	7	7	6	33.333333
Total:		292	290	311	297.6667	

PON 400-09-401  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
12	County of Humboldt	Financing Plan	8	6	8	7.333333
		Eligible Improvements	7	8	8	7.666667
		Loading Order	8	7	8	7.666667
		Home energy Ratings, Energy Audits, and Building Commissioning	8	8	7	7.666667
		Property Qualifications	8	7	9	8
		Legal Considerations	7	7	8	7.333333
		Sustainability	8	7	9	8
		Regional Approach	9	8	9	8.666667
		Verification of Energy Savings	8	8	7	7.666667
		Participant Recruitment and communication	8	6	7	7
		Quality Assurance/Conformance with California Law	8	8	7	7.666667
		Team Organizational Structure	7	8	8	7.666667
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	9	9	25
		Energy, Peak Demand, and GHG Emissions Reductions	8	6	8	22
		Economically Disadvantaged Areas	8	8	9	16.66667
		Time Criticality	7	6	7	6.666667
		Program Transparency and Reporting	7	8	8	7.666667
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	7	8	7	14.66667
		Statement of Work	7	8	7	29.33333
		Uses for Energy Commission Funds	8	8	9	8.333333
		Leveraged Funds/Resources	6	7	7	20
		Program Cost Effectiveness	9	7	8	24
Program Budget	7	7	7	35		
Total:			299	296	310	301.6667

PON 400-09-401  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
13	County of Sonoma	Financing Plan	7	7	9	7.666667
		Eligible Improvements	5	6	6	5.666667
		Loading Order	6	6	8	6.666667
		Home energy Ratings, Energy Audits, and Building Commissioning	6	7	7	6.666667
		Property Qualifications	6	8	8	7.333333
		Legal Considerations	9	8	9	8.666667
		Sustainability	8	8	9	8.333333
		Regional Approach	6	8	8	7.333333
		Verification of Energy Savings	8	8	7	7.666667
		Participant Recruitment and communication	7	7	8	7.333333
		Quality Assurance/Conformance with California Law	8	8	8	8
		Team Organizational Structure	8	7	9	8
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	7	8	22
		Energy, Peak Demand, and GHG Emissions Reductions	8	6	8	22
		Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	4	5	9.333333
		Time Criticality	8	8	8	8
		Program Transparency and Reporting	7	8	9	8
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	8	8	8	16
		Statement of Work	7	6	7	26.66667
		Uses for Energy Commission Funds	7	8	9	8
		Leveraged Funds/Resources	8	8	9	25
		Program Cost Effectiveness	8	7	8	23
Program Budget	8	7	8	38.33333		
Total:			293	279	315	295.6667

PON 400-09-401  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
14	County of Los Angeles	Financing Plan	8	7	8	7.666667
		Eligible Improvements	5	6	7	6
		Loading Order	8	8	7	7.666667
		Home energy Ratings, Energy Audits, and Building Commissioning	6	8	7	7
		Property Qualifications	8	7	8	7.666667
		Legal Considerations	7	8	8	7.666667
		Sustainability	7	5	7	6.333333
		Regional Approach	8	8	7	7.666667
		Verification of Energy Savings	7	8	7	7.333333
		Participant Recruitment and communication	8	7	6	7
		Quality Assurance/Conformance with California Law	8	7	6	7
		Team Organizational Structure	7	7	6	6.666667
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	6	4	6	16
		Energy, Peak Demand, and GHG Emissions Reductions	5	4	6	15
		Economically Disadvantaged Areas	6	7	5	12
		Time Criticality	5	5	7	5.666667
		Program Transparency and Reporting	6	5	7	6
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	6	7	7	13.333333
		Statement of Work	5	4	5	18.666667
		Uses for Energy Commission Funds	6	5	7	6
		Leveraged Funds/Resources	6	6	8	20
		Program Cost Effectiveness	6	5	6	17
Program Budget	5	5	6	26.666667		
Total:			242	227	257	242

PON 400-09-401  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
15	Mendocino County	Financing Plan	6	6	8	6.666667
		Eligible Improvements	5	4	5	4.666667
		Loading Order	5	7	5	5.666667
		Home energy Ratings, Energy Audits, and Building Commissioning	5	4	5	4.666667
		Property Qualifications	5	6	7	6
		Legal Considerations	3	4	5	4
		Sustainability	5	5	7	5.666667
		Regional Approach	6	6	8	6.666667
		Verification of Energy Savings	3	5	4	4
		Participant Recruitment and communication	5	7	5	5.666667
		Quality Assurance/Conformance with California Law	4	4	5	4.333333
		Team Organizational Structure	3	4	5	4
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	4	5	6	15
		Energy, Peak Demand, and GHG Emissions Reductions	4	5	5	14
		Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	7	7	14
		Time Criticality	5	5	5	5
		Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	6	5.333333
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	5	6	10.66667
		Statement of Work	4	4	6	18.66667
		Uses for Energy Commission Funds	5	5	5	5
		Leveraged Funds/Resources	6	6	7	19
		Program Cost Effectiveness	3	3	4	10
Program Budget	7	6	6	31.66667		
Total:			196	204	231	210.3333

PON 400-09-401  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
16	Placer County	Financing Plan	0	0	0	0
		Eligible Improvements	0	0	0	0
		Loading Order	0	0	0	0
		Home energy Ratings, Energy Audits, and Building Commissioning	0	0	0	0
		Property Qualifications	0	0	0	0
		Legal Considerations	0	0	0	0
		Sustainability	0	0	0	0
		Regional Approach	0	0	0	0
		Verification of Energy Savings	0	0	0	0
		Participant Recruitment and communication	0	0	0	0
		Quality Assurance/Conformance with California Law	0	0	0	0
		Team Organizational Structure	0	0	0	0
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	0	0	0	0
		Energy, Peak Demand, and GHG Emissions Reductions	0	0	0	0
		Economically Disadvantaged Areas	0	0	0	0
		Time Criticality	0	0	0	0
		Program Transparency and Reporting	0	0	0	0
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	0	0	0	0
		Statement of Work	0	0	0	0
		Uses for Energy Commission Funds	0	0	0	0
		Leveraged Funds/Resources	0	0	0	0
Program Cost Effectiveness	0	0	0	0		
Program Budget	0	0	0	0		
Total:		0	0	0	0	



400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
Humitech of Northern California, LLC	Targeted Measures	5	3	3	7.333333
	Public and Private Partnerships	5	3	3	3.666667
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	4	3.333333
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	3	3	4	6.666667
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6
	Quality Assurance	3	3	5	3.666667
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	3	3	3	6
	Team Organization Structure	3	3	3	3
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	7	7	7	21
	Time Criticality	3	3	3	3
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6
	Statement of Work	6	5	5	21.333333
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	7	7	7	28
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	7	7	7	21
	Program Budget	4	3	3	16.66667
	Total Score:	185	170	175	176.6667

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
City of Long Beach	Targeted Measures	3	3	3	6	
	Public and Private Partnerships	6	6	4	5.333333	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	3	3	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	5	6	10.66667	
	Sustainability	3	3	2	5.333333	
	Quality Assurance	3	3	2	2.666667	
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Team Organization Structure	3	3	3	3	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	5	5	15	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	2	8	
	Time Criticality	3	3	2	2.666667	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	3	3	3	3	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6	
	Statement of Work	5	5	4	18.66667	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	5	5	4	18.66667	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	2	8	
	Program Budget	3	3	2	13.33333	
	Total Score:		151	149	126	142

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
Sierra Business Council	Targeted Measures	8	8	8	16
	Public and Private Partnerships	7	7	7	7
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	7	8	6	7
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	8	7	8	15.333333
	Sustainability	3	4	4	7.333333
	Quality Assurance	5	6	4	5
	Verification of Energy Savings	6	6	6	12
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	6	7	6	12.66667
	Team Organization Structure	6	7	6	6.333333
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	7	6	20
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	5	5	15
	Time Criticality	6	5	4	5
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	4	4.666667
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	7	7	6	13.33333
	Statement of Work	8	7	6	28
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	5	6	5	21.33333
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	6	6	3	15
	Program Budget	5	5	5	25
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>243</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>218</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
City of Vista	Targeted Measures	0	0	0	0
	Public and Private Partnerships	3	3	3	3
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	4	3.333333
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	3	3	3	6
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	3	3	4	6.666667
	Team Organization Structure	3	3	3	3
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	3	9
	Time Criticality	5	5	3	4.333333
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	3	4.333333
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6
	Statement of Work	4	3	3	13.333333
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	5	5	5	20
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	4	3	3	10
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>133</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>125</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
McKinstry	Targeted Measures	3	3	3	6	
	Public and Private Partnerships	4	3	4	3.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	4	3.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	3	3	3	6	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3	
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	3	4	8	
	Team Organization Structure	4	3	3	3.333333	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	3	9	
	Time Criticality	3	3	3	3	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Statement of Work	6	5	5	21.333333	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	5	3	3	14.666667	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	9	
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15	
	Total Score:		150	130	134	138

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Joint Venture Silicon Valley Network	Targeted Measures	6	7	6	12.66667	
	Public and Private Partnerships	8	7	7	7.333333	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	7	7	7	7	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	6	6	4	10.66667	
	Sustainability	6	6	4	10.66667	
	Quality Assurance	6	6	5	5.666667	
	Verification of Energy Savings	5	5	3	8.666667	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	6	4	10	
	Team Organization Structure	7	6	6	6.333333	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	5	5	15	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	5	6	16	
	Time Criticality	7	7	8	7.333333	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	7	7	7	14	
	Statement of Work	7	7	8	29.33333	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	6	6	4	21.33333	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	6	6	5	17	
	Program Budget	6	5	6	28.33333	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>240</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>232.3333</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Portland Energy Conservation, Inc.	Targeted Measures	8	8	9	16.66667	
	Public and Private Partnerships	8	8	8	8	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	7	7	7	7	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	8	7	14.66667	
	Sustainability	7	7	8	14.66667	
	Quality Assurance	8	7	6	7	
	Verification of Energy Savings	8	7	6	14	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	7	7	8	14.66667	
	Team Organization Structure	7	7	8	7.333333	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	8	8	23	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	7	8	8	23	
	Time Criticality	5	5	6	5.333333	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	6	7	8	7	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	8	8	8	16	
	Statement of Work	7	7	7	28	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	8	6	6	26.66667	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	6	7	7	20	
	Program Budget	7	7	6	33.33333	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>286</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>286.3333</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Targeted Measures	7	7	7	14	
	Public and Private Partnerships	5	3	5	4.333333	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	4	3	5	4	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	3	3	5	7.333333	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3	
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	3	3	4	6.666667	
	Team Organization Structure	4	3	3	3.333333	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	7	7	7	21	
	Time Criticality	5	5	5	5	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6	
	Statement of Work	4	3	3	13.333333	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	7	7	7	28	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	5	7	7	19	
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>174</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>176</b>



400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
<b>REJECTED Fluoresco</b>	Targeted Measures	0	0	0	0
	Public and Private Partnerships	0	0	0	0
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	0	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	0	0	0	0
	Sustainability	0	0	0	0
	Quality Assurance	0	0	0	0
	Verification of Energy Savings	0	0	0	0
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	0	0	0	0
	Team Organization Structure	0	0	0	0
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	0	0	0	0
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	0	0	0	0
	Time Criticality	0	0	0	0
	Program Transparency and Reporting	0	0	0	0
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	0	0	0	0
	Statement of Work	0	0	0	0
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	0	0	0	0
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	0	0	0	0
	Program Budget	0	0	0	0
Total Score:	0	0	0	0	

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Western Riverside Council of Governments	Targeted Measures	3	3	3	6	
	Public and Private Partnerships	3	3	5	3.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	3	4	4	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	6	6	11.333333	
	Sustainability	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Quality Assurance	4	3	3	3.333333	
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Team Organization Structure	3	3	3	3	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	4	3	4	11	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	3	9	
	Time Criticality	6	7	7	6.666667	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6	
	Statement of Work	6	5	5	21.333333	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	7	7	7	28	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	5	5	3	13	
	Program Budget	5	3	3	18.333333	
	Total Score:		185	162	162	169.6667

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
FCI Management Consultants, Inc.	Targeted Measures	8	7	7	14.66667	
	Public and Private Partnerships	4	3	3	3.333333	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	4	3.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Verification of Energy Savings	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	3	3	4	6.666667	
	Team Organization Structure	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	3	9	
	Time Criticality	3	3	3	3	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	3	3	4	3.333333	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6	
	Statement of Work	5	3	3	14.66667	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	5	3	3	14.66667	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	2	3	3	8	
	Program Budget	4	3	3	16.66667	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>159</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>139.6667</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
City of San Diego	Targeted Measures	0	0	0	0	
	Public and Private Partnerships	3	3	4	3.333333	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	4	3	4	3.666667	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	3	3	4	6.666667	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3	
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	3	3	3	6	
	Team Organization Structure	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	4	10	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	4	3	3	10	
	Time Criticality	3	3	3	3	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6	
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	8	7	7	29.333333	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	9	
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>142</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>137.6667</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Targeted Measures	5	5	3	8.666667	
	Public and Private Partnerships	4	4	3	3.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	4	3	4	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	4	4	6	9.333333	
	Sustainability	4	4	3	7.333333	
	Quality Assurance	4	5	3	4	
	Verification of Energy Savings	5	4	5	9.333333	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	4	5	9.333333	
	Team Organization Structure	4	5	5	4.666667	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	4	3	3	10	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	6	6	17	
	Time Criticality	5	6	5	5.333333	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	3	5	4	4	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	4	5	4	8.666667	
	Statement of Work	3	3	2	10.66667	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	5	4	16	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	5	5	5	15	
	Program Budget	4	5	4	21.66667	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>165</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>168.6667</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District	Targeted Measures	7	5	5	11.33333
	Public and Private Partnerships	3	3	4	3.333333
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	3	3
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	3	4	8
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6
	Quality Assurance	4	3	3	3.333333
	Verification of Energy Savings	4	3	3	6.666667
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	4	3	3	6.666667
	Team Organization Structure	3	3	3	3
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	3	3	11
	Time Criticality	3	3	3	3
	Program Transparency and Reporting	3	3	5	3.666667
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6
	Statement of Work	4	3	3	13.33333
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	12
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	2	3	3	8
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>144</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>129</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Energy Services & Technologies, Inc.	Targeted Measures	8	7	7	14.66667	
	Public and Private Partnerships	2	3	3	2.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	5	5	11.333333	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3	
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	3	4	8	
	Team Organization Structure	4	3	3	3.333333	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	4	10	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	6	5	4	15	
	Time Criticality	6	5	4	5	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	3	3	4	3.333333	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6	
	Statement of Work	7	5	5	22.66667	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	5	3	3	14.66667	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	5	4	3	12	
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>186</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>162.3333</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
West Basin Municipal Water District	Targeted Measures	7	6	5	12	
	Public and Private Partnerships	7	6	5	6	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	6	4	4	9.333333	
	Sustainability	5	4	3	8	
	Quality Assurance	5	4	3	4	
	Verification of Energy Savings	5	4	3	8	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	6	4	4	9.333333	
	Team Organization Structure	5	4	3	4	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	6	5	18	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	7	7	7	21	
	Time Criticality	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	6	5	5	10.66667	
	Statement of Work	7	6	5	24	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	5	5	5	20	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	7	7	7	21	
	Program Budget	6	4	4	23.33333	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>246</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>214.6667</b>



400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
City of Anaheim, Anaheim Public Utilities	Targeted Measures	7	6	5	12	
	Public and Private Partnerships	7	7	6	6.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	6	6	6	6	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	5	5	11.333333	
	Sustainability	6	5	5	10.666667	
	Quality Assurance	5	5	5	5	
	Verification of Energy Savings	6	5	5	10.666667	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	7	7	5	12.666667	
	Team Organization Structure	6	6	5	5.666667	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	6	5	18	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	7	6	7	20	
	Time Criticality	7	5	5	5.666667	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	7	7	7	14	
	Statement of Work	8	7	7	29.333333	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	6	6	7	25.333333	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	7	6	7	20	
	Program Budget	5	6	6	28.333333	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>261</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>246.6667</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
Intercap Energy Systems, LLC.	Targeted Measures	5	3	3	7.333333
	Public and Private Partnerships	3	3	3	3
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	4	3.333333
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	3	3	3	6
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6
	Quality Assurance	4	3	3	3.333333
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	3	3	3	6
	Team Organization Structure	5	3	3	3.666667
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	4	10
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	2	3	3	8
	Time Criticality	5	5	5	5
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6
	Statement of Work	4	3	4	14.66667
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	12
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	2	3	3	8
	Program Budget	5	3	3	18.33333
	Total Score:	<b>139</b>	124	132	131.6667

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Energy Innovation Group, LLC.	Targeted Measures	7	5	5	11.33333	
	Public and Private Partnerships	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	5	6	5.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	6	5	5	10.66667	
	Sustainability	5	5	5	10	
	Quality Assurance	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Verification of Energy Savings	7	5	5	11.33333	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	5	6	10.66667	
	Team Organization Structure	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	5	6	16	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	7	7	7	21	
	Time Criticality	5	5	5	5	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	6	7	7	6.66667	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	5	5	10	
	Statement of Work	7	5	5	22.66667	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	6	7	7	26.66667	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	6	7	7	20	
	Program Budget	6	5	5	26.66667	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>240</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>230</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Willdan Energy Solutions dba Intergy Corporation	Targeted Measures	4	5	5	9.333333	
	Public and Private Partnerships	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	4	3	4	3.666667	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	3	3	3	6	
	Sustainability	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3	
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	3	3	4	6.666667	
	Team Organization Structure	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	3	3	11	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	5	5	15	
	Time Criticality	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Statement of Work	6	5	5	21.333333	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	5	3	3	14.666667	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	7	7	5	19	
	Program Budget	6	5	5	26.666667	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>200</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>175</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
City of San Fernando	Targeted Measures	3	3	3	6
	Public and Private Partnerships	3	3	3	3
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	3	5	4.333333
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	3	3	7.333333
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3
	Verification of Energy Savings	4	3	3	6.666667
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	3	4	8
	Team Organization Structure	3	3	3	3
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	6	5	5	16
	Time Criticality	6	5	5	5.333333
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	3	4	4
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	3	3	7.333333
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	4	5	5	18.666667
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	5	5	5	15
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15
	Total Score:	160	142	147	149.66667

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
CTG Energetics	Targeted Measures	8	8	8	16	
	Public and Private Partnerships	7	7	5	6.333333	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	7	5	5.666667	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	7	5	11.333333	
	Sustainability	4	6	5	10	
	Quality Assurance	6	7	7	6.666667	
	Verification of Energy Savings	6	7	5	12	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	6	8	6	13.333333	
	Team Organization Structure	7	7	6	6.666667	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	6	5	16	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	7	5	5	17	
	Time Criticality	6	6	7	6.333333	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	7	6	5	6	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	8	8	6	14.666667	
	Statement of Work	7	6	7	26.666667	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	8	8	6	29.333333	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	7	6	5	18	
	Program Budget	5	6	6	28.333333	
	Total Score:		254	265	232	250.3333

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Sylvania Lighting Services	Targeted Measures	7	7	6	13.33333	
	Public and Private Partnerships	5	5	4	4.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	6	5	5.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	4	5	4	8.666667	
	Sustainability	4	5	4	8.666667	
	Quality Assurance	5	5	5	5	
	Verification of Energy Savings	6	6	4	10.66667	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	7	6	5	12	
	Team Organization Structure	6	7	5	6	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	6	4	15	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	4	4	3	11	
	Time Criticality	7	5	5	5.666667	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	7	7	6	6.666667	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	8	8	6	14.66667	
	Statement of Work	8	7	6	28	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	4	6	5	20	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	5	5	5	15	
	Program Budget	5	5	5	25	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>222</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>215.3333</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
City of Pasadena Water and Power Development	Targeted Measures	7	5	5	11.33333	
	Public and Private Partnerships	6	5	6	5.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	5	5	10	
	Sustainability	5	5	5	10	
	Quality Assurance	7	5	5	5.666667	
	Verification of Energy Savings	6	5	5	10.66667	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	5	4	9.333333	
	Team Organization Structure	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	5	4	14	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	6	5	5	16	
	Time Criticality	3	5	5	4.333333	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	6	5	5	10.66667	
	Statement of Work	6	5	5	21.33333	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	7	7	7	28	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	7	7	7	21	
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>222</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>207.3333</b>



400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
Roseville Electric, City of Roseville	Targeted Measures	5	5	5	10
	Public and Private Partnerships	3	3	3	3
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	4	3.333333
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	3	3	7.333333
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6
	Quality Assurance	5	3	3	3.666667
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	3	4	8
	Team Organization Structure	4	3	3	3.333333
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	3	3	11
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	3	9
	Time Criticality	5	5	5	5
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	3	3	7.333333
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	5	5	5	20
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	4	6	4	14
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>160</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>142</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Roseville Electric, City of Roseville	Targeted Measures	5	5	5	10	
	Public and Private Partnerships	3	3	3	3	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	4	3.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	3	4	8	
	Team Organization Structure	4	3	3	3.333333	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	3	3	11	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	3	9	
	Time Criticality	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	12	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	3	4	3	10	
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>150</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>137.3333</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Valence Energy	Targeted Measures	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Public and Private Partnerships	7	5	5	5.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	5	5	5	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	4	5	6	10	
	Sustainability	5	5	5	10	
	Quality Assurance	5	5	5	5	
	Verification of Energy Savings	7	5	5	11.333333	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	6	5	4	10	
	Team Organization Structure	5	5	5	5	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	6	7	7	20	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	7	5	5	17	
	Time Criticality	6	3	3	4	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	7	7	7	7	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	6	5	5	10.666667	
	Statement of Work	8	7	7	29.333333	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	5	3	3	14.666667	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	5	5	5	15	
	Program Budget	5	3	3	18.333333	
	Total Score:		230	192	192	204.66667

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
Western Allied Corporation	Targeted Measures	3	3	3	6
	Public and Private Partnerships	4	3	4	3.666667
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	4	3.333333
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	3	3	7.333333
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	3	4	8
	Team Organization Structure	4	3	3	3.333333
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	3	3	11
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	3	9
	Time Criticality	5	3	3	3.666667
	Program Transparency and Reporting	4	5	5	4.666667
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6
	Statement of Work	4	3	3	13.333333
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	12
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	3	4	3	10
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>143</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>126</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
Western Allied Corporation	Targeted Measures	3	3	3	6
	Public and Private Partnerships	4	3	4	3.666667
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	4	3.333333
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	3	3	7.333333
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	3	4	8
	Team Organization Structure	4	3	3	3.333333
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	3	3	11
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	3	9
	Time Criticality	5	3	3	3.666667
	Program Transparency and Reporting	4	5	5	4.666667
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6
	Statement of Work	4	3	3	13.333333
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	12
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	3	4	3	10
	Program Budget	7	3	3	15
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>143</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>126</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Western Allied Corporation	Targeted Measures	3	3	3	6	
	Public and Private Partnerships	4	3	4	3.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	4	3.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3	
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Team Organization Structure	4	3	4	3.666667	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	3	3	11	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	3	9	
	Time Criticality	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	4	5	5	4.666667	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6	
	Statement of Work	4	3	3	13.333333	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	12	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	3	4	3	10	
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>143</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>131</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
Western Allied Corporation	Targeted Measures	3	3	3	6
	Public and Private Partnerships	4	3	4	3.666667
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	4	3.333333
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	3	3	7.333333
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	3	4	8
	Team Organization Structure	4	3	3	3.333333
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	3	3	11
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	3	9
	Time Criticality	5	3	4	4
	Program Transparency and Reporting	4	5	5	4.666667
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6
	Statement of Work	4	3	3	13.333333
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	12
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	3	4	3	10
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15
	Total Score:	143	125	127	131.6667

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
Western Allied Corporation	Targeted Measures	3	3	3	6
	Public and Private Partnerships	4	3	4	3.666667
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	4	3.333333
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	3	3	7.333333
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	3	3	7.333333
	Team Organization Structure	4	3	3	3.333333
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	3	3	11
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	3	9
	Time Criticality	5	3	4	4
	Program Transparency and Reporting	4	5	5	4.666667
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6
	Statement of Work	4	3	3	13.333333
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	12
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	3	4	3	10
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>143</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>125</b>



400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
Western Allied Corporation	Targeted Measures	3	3	3	6
	Public and Private Partnerships	4	3	4	3.666667
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	4	3.333333
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	3	3	7.333333
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6
	Quality Assurance	3	3	4	3.333333
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	3	3	7.333333
	Team Organization Structure	4	3	3	3.333333
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	3	3	11
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	3	9
	Time Criticality	5	3	3	3.666667
	Program Transparency and Reporting	4	5	5	4.666667
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6
	Statement of Work	4	3	3	13.333333
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	12
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	3	4	3	10
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>143</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>125</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
(LEAD) City of Oceanside	Targeted Measures	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Public and Private Partnerships	4	3	4	3.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	4	3	3	3.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	3	5	8.666667	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3	
	Verification of Energy Savings	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Team Organization Structure	4	3	3	3.333333	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	5	5	17	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	6	3	5	14	
	Time Criticality	5	5	5	5	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	7	7	6.333333	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	6	5	5	10.666667	
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	4	3	3	13.333333	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	5	4	4	13	
	Program Budget	4	3	3	16.666667	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>179</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>156</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
NoRTEC	Targeted Measures	7	6	6	12.66667	
	Public and Private Partnerships	7	7	5	6.333333	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	7	7	14	
	Sustainability	5	5	5	10	
	Quality Assurance	6	5	4	5	
	Verification of Energy Savings	5	5	5	10	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	6	5	5	10.66667	
	Team Organization Structure	7	6	5	6	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	7	5	19	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	6	5	6	17	
	Time Criticality	5	5	4	4.666667	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	6	5.333333	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	7	5	5	11.33333	
	Statement of Work	6	6	5	22.66667	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	5	5	4	18.66667	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	5	4	3	12	
	Program Budget	6	5	5	26.66667	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>238</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>217.3333</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Enovity, Inc.	Targeted Measures	7	7	7	14	
	Public and Private Partnerships	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	4	3.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3	
	Verification of Energy Savings	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	3	3	3	6	
	Team Organization Structure	5	3	5	4.333333	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	7	7	7	21	
	Time Criticality	5	5	5	5	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	4	5	5	4.666667	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	5	5	10	
	Statement of Work	4	3	3	13.333333	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	5	3	3	14.666667	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	5	4	4	13	
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>175</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>160</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
The Regents of the University of California	Targeted Measures	7	7	7	14	
	Public and Private Partnerships	5	3	5	4.333333	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	3	3	3	6	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	4	3	3	3.333333	
	Verification of Energy Savings	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	3	3	3	6	
	Team Organization Structure	5	3	5	4.333333	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	3	3	11	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	7	7	7	21	
	Time Criticality	7	7	7	7	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	7	7	7	7	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	5	5	10	
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	5	5	5	20	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	7	7	7	21	
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>187</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>178.3333</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Sheet Metal Workers' Local 104 & Bay Area Industry Training Fund	Targeted Measures	5	5	5	10	
	Public and Private Partnerships	4	3	4	3.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	3	3	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	3	3	4	6.666667	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Verification of Energy Savings	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	3	3	4	6.666667	
	Team Organization Structure	3	3	3	3	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	5	5	15	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	7	7	7	21	
	Time Criticality	3	3	3	3	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	7	7	7	7	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6	
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	12	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	6	5	5	16	
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>162</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>157</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
<b>REJECTED Solar Sense, INC</b>	Targeted Measures	0	0	0	0
	Public and Private Partnerships	0	0	0	0
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	0	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	0	0	0	0
	Sustainability	0	0	0	0
	Quality Assurance	0	0	0	0
	Verification of Energy Savings	0	0	0	0
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	0	0	0	0
	Team Organization Structure	0	0	0	0
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	0	0	0	0
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	0	0	0	0
	Time Criticality	0	0	0	0
	Program Transparency and Reporting	0	0	0	0
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	0	0	0	0
	Statement of Work	0	0	0	0
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	0	0	0	0
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	0	0	0	0
	Program Budget	0	0	0	0
	Total Score:	0	0	0	0

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Federspiel Corporation	Targeted Measures	7	8	8	15.33333	
	Public and Private Partnerships	7	7	6	6.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	6	6	8	6.666667	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	7	6	13.33333	
	Sustainability	6	7	8	14	
	Quality Assurance	5	7	7	6.333333	
	Verification of Energy Savings	6	7	6	12.66667	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	7	7	7	14	
	Team Organization Structure	5	6	7	6	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	8	7	8	23	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	7	7	7	21	
	Time Criticality	7	6	6	6.333333	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	6	6	8	13.33333	
	Statement of Work	7	7	8	29.33333	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	6	6	6	24	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	7	7	7	21	
	Program Budget	5	4	5	23.33333	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>257</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>261.6667</b>



400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
California School Boards Association Finance Corporation	Targeted Measures	6	5	5	10.66667	
	Public and Private Partnerships	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	5	6	5.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	5	4	9.333333	
	Sustainability	5	5	5	10	
	Quality Assurance	5	5	5	5	
	Verification of Energy Savings	5	5	5	10	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	5	5	10	
	Team Organization Structure	5	5	6	5.333333	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	5	5	17	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	3	9	
	Time Criticality	5	5	5	5	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	5	5	10	
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	7	7	7	28	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	9	
	Program Budget	5	5	5	25	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>197</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>191</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Enovative Group, Inc.	Targeted Measures	7	7	7	14	
	Public and Private Partnerships	5	5	5	5	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	6	5	4	10	
	Sustainability	5	5	5	10	
	Quality Assurance	5	5	5	5	
	Verification of Energy Savings	5	5	5	10	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	5	4	9.333333	
	Team Organization Structure	5	5	5	5	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	5	5	17	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	7	7	7	21	
	Time Criticality	5	5	5	5	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	7	7	7	7	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	5	5	10	
	Statement of Work	6	5	5	21.333333	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	6	5	5	21.333333	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	7	7	7	21	
	Program Budget	5	5	5	25	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>235</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>222.3333</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Energy Solutions	Targeted Measures	8	9	9	17.33333	
	Public and Private Partnerships	8	9	7	8	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	8	8	7	7.666667	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	6	7	6	12.66667	
	Sustainability	8	8	8	16	
	Quality Assurance	7	8	8	7.666667	
	Verification of Energy Savings	7	7	8	14.66667	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	8	9	7	16	
	Team Organization Structure	8	8	8	8	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	8	8	23	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	8	7	8	23	
	Time Criticality	9	7	7	7.666667	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	7	7	8	7.333333	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	8	9	9	17.33333	
	Statement of Work	7	6	8	28	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	6	6	8	26.66667	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	8	8	8	24	
	Program Budget	7	6	7	33.33333	
	Total Score:		293	292	310	298.3333

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA)	Targeted Measures	7	6	5	12	
	Public and Private Partnerships	7	5	6	6	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	8	7	7	7.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	5	5	11.333333	
	Sustainability	7	5	6	12	
	Quality Assurance	7	5	5	5.666667	
	Verification of Energy Savings	6	5	5	10.66667	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	7	7	6	13.33333	
	Team Organization Structure	6	6	5	5.666667	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	6	5	5	16	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	6	5	5	16	
	Time Criticality	7	6	5	6	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	6	6	5	11.33333	
	Statement of Work	7	5	5	22.66667	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	6	6	7	25.33333	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	7	6	7	20	
	Program Budget	5	4	5	23.33333	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>254</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>229.6667</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
North Orange County CCD	Targeted Measures	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Public and Private Partnerships	3	3	5	3.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	3	3	3	6	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	3	3	4	3.333333	
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Team Organization Structure	3	3	4	3.333333	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	5	5	15	
	Time Criticality	5	5	5	5	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6	
	Statement of Work	4	3	3	13.333333	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	6	5	5	21.333333	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	4	3	3	10	
	Program Budget	5	3	3	18.333333	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>167</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>149</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
Rancho Santiago Community College District	Targeted Measures	5	3	3	7.333333
	Public and Private Partnerships	3	3	5	3.666667
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	3	4	4
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	3	3	3	6
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	4	3	4	7.333333
	Team Organization Structure	3	3	3	3
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	5	5	15
	Time Criticality	5	5	5	5
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6
	Statement of Work	4	3	3	13.33333
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	6	5	5	21.33333
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	4	3	3	10
	Program Budget	5	3	3	18.33333
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>167</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>143</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
North Orange County CCD	Targeted Measures	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Public and Private Partnerships	3	3	5	3.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	3	5	4.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	3	3	3	6	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3	
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Team Organization Structure	3	3	4	3.333333	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	5	5	15	
	Time Criticality	5	5	5	5	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6	
	Statement of Work	4	3	3	13.333333	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	6	5	5	21.333333	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	4	3	3	10	
	Program Budget	5	3	3	18.333333	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>167</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>149.3333</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Mazzeti Nash Lipsey Burch (M+NLB)	Targeted Measures	7	7	7	14	
	Public and Private Partnerships	5	5	5	5	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	5	6	5.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	6	5	5	10.66667	
	Sustainability	7	5	5	11.33333	
	Quality Assurance	5	5	4	4.666667	
	Verification of Energy Savings	5	5	5	10	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	5	5	10	
	Team Organization Structure	5	5	5	5	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	5	5	17	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	5	5	15	
	Time Criticality	5	5	4	4.666667	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	5	5	10	
	Statement of Work	4	3	3	13.33333	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	5	7	7	25.33333	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	7	7	7	21	
	Program Budget	4	3	3	16.66667	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>213</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>204</b>



400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Mazzeti Nash Lipsey Burch (M+NLB)	Targeted Measures	7	7	7	14	
	Public and Private Partnerships	5	5	5	5	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	5	6	5.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	6	5	5	10.66667	
	Sustainability	7	5	5	11.33333	
	Quality Assurance	5	5	4	4.666667	
	Verification of Energy Savings	5	5	5	10	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	5	5	10	
	Team Organization Structure	5	5	5	5	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	5	5	17	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	5	5	15	
	Time Criticality	5	5	4	4.666667	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	5	5	10	
	Statement of Work	4	3	3	13.33333	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	5	7	7	25.33333	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	7	7	7	21	
	Program Budget	4	3	3	16.66667	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>213</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>204</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
<b>REJECTED Interfaith Power and Light</b>	Targeted Measures	0	0	0	0
	Public and Private Partnerships	0	0	0	0
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	0	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	0	0	0	0
	Sustainability	0	0	0	0
	Quality Assurance	0	0	0	0
	Verification of Energy Savings	0	0	0	0
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	0	0	0	0
	Team Organization Structure	0	0	0	0
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	0	0	0	0
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	0	0	0	0
	Time Criticality	0	0	0	0
	Program Transparency and Reporting	0	0	0	0
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	0	0	0	0
	Statement of Work	0	0	0	0
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	0	0	0	0
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	0	0	0	0
	Program Budget	0	0	0	0
	Total Score:	0	0	0	0

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
<b>REJECTED Finelite</b>	Targeted Measures	0	0	0	0
	Public and Private Partnerships	0	0	0	0
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	0	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	0	0	0	0
	Sustainability	0	0	0	0
	Quality Assurance	0	0	0	0
	Verification of Energy Savings	0	0	0	0
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	0	0	0	0
	Team Organization Structure	0	0	0	0
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	0	0	0	0
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	0	0	0	0
	Time Criticality	0	0	0	0
	Program Transparency and Reporting	0	0	0	0
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	0	0	0	0
	Statement of Work	0	0	0	0
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	0	0	0	0
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	0	0	0	0
	Program Budget	0	0	0	0
	Total Score:	0	0	0	0

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
City of Los Angeles	Targeted Measures	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Public and Private Partnerships	3	3	5	3.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	3	3	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	4	3	4	7.333333	
	Sustainability	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Quality Assurance	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Verification of Energy Savings	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Team Organization Structure	4	3	3	3.333333	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	7	7	21	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	3	9	
	Time Criticality	5	5	5	5	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6	
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	4	3	3	13.333333	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	4	4	3	11	
	Program Budget	5	3	3	18.333333	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>172</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>150.3333</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
County of Merced	Targeted Measures	5	3	3	7.333333
	Public and Private Partnerships	5	3	5	4.333333
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	3	3
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	6	6	6	12
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6
	Quality Assurance	5	3	3	3.666667
	Verification of Energy Savings	5	3	3	7.333333
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	3	3	7.333333
	Team Organization Structure	5	3	3	3.666667
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	5	5	15
	Time Criticality	5	5	5	5
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	6	5.333333
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	5	5	5	20
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	4	3	4	11
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15
	Total Score:	165	144	150	153

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Richard Heath and Associates, Inc.	Targeted Measures	5	5	5	10	
	Public and Private Partnerships	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	3	5	4.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	6	6	6	12	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	4	3	4	3.666667	
	Verification of Energy Savings	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Team Organization Structure	3	3	3	3	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	5	5	15	
	Time Criticality	3	3	4	3.333333	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	12	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	6	4	5	15	
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>161</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>151.3333</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
County of Sonoma	Targeted Measures	3	3	3	6	
	Public and Private Partnerships	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	3	5	4.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	3	3	3	6	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3	
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	3	5	8.666667	
	Team Organization Structure	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	3	9	
	Time Criticality	5	5	5	5	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	3	3	5	3.666667	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6	
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	5	5	5	20	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	5	5	3	13	
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>147</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>141.6667</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Resource Solutions Group	Targeted Measures	3	3	3	6	
	Public and Private Partnerships	3	3	3	3	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Verification of Energy Savings	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Team Organization Structure	3	3	4	3.333333	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	5	5	15	
	Time Criticality	3	3	3	3	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6	
	Statement of Work	5	5	5	20	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	5	3	3	14.666667	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	6	5	5	16	
	Program Budget	6	5	5	26.666667	
	Total Score:		181	154	155	163.3333



400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Windwood Designs	Targeted Measures	7	7	7	14	
	Public and Private Partnerships	3	3	3	3	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	4	3.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Verification of Energy Savings	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Team Organization Structure	3	3	3	3	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	3	3	11	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	3	9	
	Time Criticality	3	3	3	3	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	3	3	4	3.333333	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6	
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	4	3	3	13.333333	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	9	
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>150</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>136</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
1Source Electrical Contractors, Inc.	Targeted Measures	7	7	7	14	
	Public and Private Partnerships	3	3	5	3.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	3	5	4.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	3	3	3	6	
	Team Organization Structure	3	3	3	3	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	5	5	15	
	Time Criticality	3	3	3	3	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	6	5.333333	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6	
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	5	5	5	20	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	6	7	5	18	
	Program Budget	4	3	3	16.66667	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>166</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>159</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
Benningfield Group, Inc.	Targeted Measures	7	7	7	14
	Public and Private Partnerships	5	7	7	6.333333
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	4	6	5	5
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	6	6	11.333333
	Sustainability	3	4	5	8
	Quality Assurance	6	5	6	5.666667
	Verification of Energy Savings	7	5	6	12
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	4	6	5	10
	Team Organization Structure	6	7	6	6.333333
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	5	5	15
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	7	7	7	21
	Time Criticality	6	5	5	5.333333
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	6	5.333333
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	7	7	7	14
	Statement of Work	7	6	6	25.333333
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	5	5	17.333333
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	7	7	5	19
	Program Budget	5	5	4	23.333333
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>220</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>222</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
PacificWest Energy Solutions, Inc.	Targeted Measures	3	3	3	6	
	Public and Private Partnerships	4	3	3	3.333333	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	4	3.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	0	0	0	0	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Verification of Energy Savings	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	3	3	3	6	
	Team Organization Structure	3	3	3	3	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	2	3	3	8	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	3	3	11	
	Time Criticality	3	3	3	3	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	3	3	4	3.333333	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6	
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	12	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	4	5	3	12	
	Program Budget	0	0	0	0	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>110</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>105.3333</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Premier Property Management, Inc.	Targeted Measures	7	7	7	14	
	Public and Private Partnerships	6	5	5	5.333333	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	4	5	5	4.666667	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	3	4	3	6.666667	
	Sustainability	4	5	5	9.333333	
	Quality Assurance	4	4	4	4	
	Verification of Energy Savings	4	4	4	8	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	5	5	10	
	Team Organization Structure	4	4	4	4	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	5	5	15	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	4	5	12	
	Time Criticality	3	4	3	3.333333	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	4	3	6.666667	
	Statement of Work	4	4	3	14.66667	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	6	5	5	21.33333	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	5	5	5	15	
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>172</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>174</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Quantum Energy Services & Technologies, Inc.	Targeted Measures	7	9	9	16.66667	
	Public and Private Partnerships	8	7	8	7.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	8	8	9	8.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	9	8	16	
	Sustainability	7	8	8	15.33333	
	Quality Assurance	8	8	8	8	
	Verification of Energy Savings	8	8	7	15.33333	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	8	8	7	15.33333	
	Team Organization Structure	7	8	8	7.666667	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	6	6	6	18	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	7	7	7	21	
	Time Criticality	7	7	6	6.666667	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	7	7	7	7	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	8	8	7	15.33333	
	Statement of Work	6	6	6	24	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	7	7	7	28	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	7	7	7	21	
	Program Budget	7	6	7	33.33333	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>282</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>284.6667</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
Power Distributors, Inc.	Targeted Measures	5	5	5	10
	Public and Private Partnerships	3	3	3	3
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	4	3.333333
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	3	3	3	6
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	3	3	3	6
	Team Organization Structure	3	3	4	3.333333
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	5	5	15
	Time Criticality	5	5	5	5
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	12
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	6	5	5	16
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15
	Total Score:	143	140	142	141.6667

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
<b>REJECTED</b> <i>Foundation for California Community Colleges</i>	Targeted Measures	0	0	0	0
	Public and Private Partnerships	0	0	0	0
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	0	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	0	0	0	0
	Sustainability	0	0	0	0
	Quality Assurance	0	0	0	0
	Verification of Energy Savings	0	0	0	0
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	0	0	0	0
	Team Organization Structure	0	0	0	0
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	0	0	0	0
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	0	0	0	0
	Time Criticality	0	0	0	0
	Program Transparency and Reporting	0	0	0	0
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	0	0	0	0
	Statement of Work	0	0	0	0
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	0	0	0	0
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	0	0	0	0
	Program Budget	0	0	0	0
	Total Score:	0	0	0	0



400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Southern California Public Power Authority (SCPPA)	Targeted Measures	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Public and Private Partnerships	3	3	5	3.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	5	3.666667	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	3	3	3	6	
	Sustainability	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3	
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Team Organization Structure	3	3	3	3	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	5	5	15	
	Time Criticality	5	5	5	5	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	3	3	4	3.333333	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6	
	Statement of Work	6	5	5	21.333333	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	12	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	5	4	5	14	
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15	
	Total Score:		156	139	147	147.3333

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
Golden State Energy Solutions	Targeted Measures	6	5	5	10.66667
	Public and Private Partnerships	4	3	3	3.333333
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	3	3	3.666667
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	5	4	9.333333
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	3	3	3	6
	Team Organization Structure	4	3	4	3.666667
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	3	9
	Time Criticality	3	3	3	3
	Program Transparency and Reporting	3	3	5	3.666667
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	3	5	8.666667
	Statement of Work	5	5	5	20
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	12
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	5	5	3	13
	Program Budget	5	5	5	25
Total Score:	162	152	151	155	

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
City of Gustine	Targeted Measures	3	3	3	6	
	Public and Private Partnerships	6	3	5	4.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	3	5	4.333333	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	6	5	6	11.333333	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3	
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	3	3	3	6	
	Team Organization Structure	3	3	4	3.333333	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	4	3	3	10	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	3	9	
	Time Criticality	5	5	5	5	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6	
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	7	7	7	28	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	9	
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>154</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>149.6667</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Volt Telecommunications Group, Inc.	Targeted Measures	5	5	5	10	
	Public and Private Partnerships	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	3	4	4	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Verification of Energy Savings	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	3	3	4	6.666667	
	Team Organization Structure	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	5	5	15	
	Time Criticality	7	7	7	7	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	12	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	5	3	5	13	
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>160</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>147</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score	
Volt Telecommunications Group, Inc.	Targeted Measures	5	5	5	10	
	Public and Private Partnerships	4	3	3	3.333333	
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	5	3	4	4	
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6	
	Quality Assurance	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Verification of Energy Savings	5	3	3	7.333333	
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	3	3	4	6.666667	
	Team Organization Structure	5	3	3	3.666667	
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9	
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	5	5	15	
	Time Criticality	4	3	3	3.333333	
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5	
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	4	3	3	6.666667	
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12	
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	12	
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	5	5	5	15	
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15	
	<b>Total Score:</b>		<b>156</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>145</b>

400-09-402  
SEP Commercial  
Summary

Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
Syzygy Technologies, Inc.	Targeted Measures	5	5	5	10
	Public and Private Partnerships	3	3	3	3
	Collaboration with Existing Efficiency Programs	3	3	3	3
	Economically Disadvantaged Areas	3	3	3	6
	Sustainability	3	3	3	6
	Quality Assurance	3	3	3	3
	Verification of Energy Savings	3	3	3	6
	Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	3	3	3	6
	Team Organization Structure	3	3	4	3.333333
	Workforce Development and Job Creation	3	3	3	9
	Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	3	9
	Time Criticality	3	3	3	3
	Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5
	Program Team Qualifications and Experience	3	3	3	6
	Statement of Work	3	3	3	12
	Fund Leverage (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	12
	Program Cost (Cost element of Program Design)	3	3	3	9
	Program Budget	3	3	3	15
	Total Score:		126	126	127

RFP 400-09-403  
SEP Residential  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
1	City of West Hollywood	Sustainability/Lasting Changes in the Market	4	3	2	6.00
		Regional Approach	4	3	4	7.33
		Quality Assurance	4	4	2	3.33
		Conformance with California Law	5	5	5	5.00
		Collaboration with national and State Programs	5	3	3	7.33
		Targeting Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	7	6	13.33
		Verification of Energy Savings	5	5	3	4.33
		Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	5	3	8.67
		Team Organization Structure	4	4	2	3.33
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	6	4	15.00
		Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	4	3	2	9.00
		Time Criticality	7	7	9	7.67
		Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	4	4.67
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	4	3	8.00
		Statement of Work	5	4	3	16.00
		Leverage Funding	4	3	2	12.00
		Program Cost-Effectiveness	5	3	3	11.00
		Program Budget	6	5	7	30.00
Total:			198	169	149	172.00

RFP 400-09-403  
SEP Residential  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
2	n/a - CTG Energetics' box was mis-marked (Proposal was submitted for -402)	Sustainability/Lasting Changes in the Market	0	0	0	0.00
		Regional Approach	0	0	0	0.00
		Quality Assurance	0	0	0	0.00
		Conformance with California Law	0	0	0	0.00
		Collaboration with national and State Programs	0	0	0	0.00
		Targeting Economically Disadvantaged Areas	0	0	0	0.00
		Verification of Energy Savings	0	0	0	0.00
		Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	0	0	0	0.00
		Team Organization Structure	0	0	0	0.00
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	0	0	0	0.00
		Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	0	0	0	0.00
		Time Criticality	0	0	0	0.00
		Program Transparency and Reporting	0	0	0	0.00
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	0	0	0	0.00
		Statement of Work	0	0	0	0.00
		Leverage Funding	0	0	0	0.00
		Program Cost-Effectiveness	0	0	0	0.00
Program Budget	0	0	0	0.00		
		<b>Total:</b>	0	0	0	0.00



RFP 400-09-403  
SEP Residential  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
3	San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)	Sustainability/Lasting Changes in the Market	6	5	7	12.00
		Regional Approach	7	7	7	14.00
		Quality Assurance	6	5	7	6.00
		Conformance with California Law	6	5	7	6.00
		Collaboration with national and State Programs	6	5	7	12.00
		Targeting Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	7	6	13.33
		Verification of Energy Savings	7	5	6	6.00
		Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	7	7	7	14.00
		Team Organization Structure	7	5	6	6.00
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	7	6	20.00
		Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	7	7	7	21.00
		Time Criticality	5	7	5	5.67
		Program Transparency and Reporting	6	7	5	6.00
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	6	5	6	11.33
		Statement of Work	7	6	7	26.67
		Leverage Funding	6	6	6	24.00
		Program Cost-Effectiveness	7	6	7	20.00
		Program Budget	8	6	7	35.00
Total:			270	244	263	259.00

RFP 400-09-403  
SEP Residential  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
4	Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG)	Sustainability/Lasting Changes in the Market	4	4	3	7.33
		Regional Approach	6	5	4	10.00
		Quality Assurance	5	5	5	5.00
		Conformance with California Law	5	5	4	4.67
		Collaboration with national and State Programs	5	4	5	9.33
		Targeting Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	7	8	14.67
		Verification of Energy Savings	6	5	6	5.67
		Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	4	5	9.33
		Team Organization Structure	6	4	4	4.67
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	4	5	14.00
		Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	2	8.00
		Time Criticality	6	4	4	4.67
		Program Transparency and Reporting	5	6	5	5.33
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	4	4	8.67
		Statement of Work	8	6	6	26.67
		Leverage Funding	4	4	2	13.33
		Program Cost-Effectiveness	3	4	2	9.00
		Program Budget	6	6	5	28.33
Total:			208	183	170	188.67

RFP 400-09-403  
SEP Residential  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
5	Roseville Electric, City of Roseville	Sustainability/Lasting Changes in the Market	5	5	3	8.67
		Regional Approach	3	4	3	6.67
		Quality Assurance	5	4	5	4.67
		Conformance with California Law	5	5	5	5.00
		Collaboration with national and State Programs	5	4	5	9.33
		Targeting Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	4	4	8.67
		Verification of Energy Savings	5	4	5	4.67
		Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	7	6	5	12.00
		Team Organization Structure	5	4	5	4.67
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	4	4	13.00
		Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	5	3	13.00
		Time Criticality	5	5	3	4.33
		Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5.00
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	4	4	8.67
		Statement of Work	5	4	3	16.00
		Leverage Funding	5	5	3	17.33
		Program Cost-Effectiveness	3	4	2	9.00
		Program Budget	5	5	3	21.67
Total:			194	181	142	172.33

RFP 400-09-403  
SEP Residential  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
6	NoRTEC	Sustainability/Lasting Changes in the Market	5	5	3	8.67
		Regional Approach	8	6	7	14.00
		Quality Assurance	6	5	6	5.67
		Conformance with California Law	5	6	7	6.00
		Collaboration with national and State Programs	5	5	6	10.67
		Targeting Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	7	9	15.33
		Verification of Energy Savings	5	6	6	5.67
		Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	5	6	10.67
		Team Organization Structure	6	5	4	5.00
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	4	5	14.00
		Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	4	4	13.00
		Time Criticality	4	4	5	4.33
		Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5.00
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	4	4	8.67
		Statement of Work	5	5	5	20.00
		Leverage Funding	6	4	4	18.67
		Program Cost-Effectiveness	4	4	3	11.00
		Program Budget	6	4	5	25.00
Total:			217	187	200	201.33

RFP 400-09-403  
SEP Residential  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
7	San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District	Sustainability/Lasting Changes in the Market	4	6	6	10.67
		Regional Approach	7	5	6	12.00
		Quality Assurance	6	5	7	6.00
		Conformance with California Law	5	5	7	5.67
		Collaboration with national and State Programs	5	5	7	11.33
		Targeting Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	8	8	15.33
		Verification of Energy Savings	5	6	6	5.67
		Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	6	7	12.00
		Team Organization Structure	6	5	6	5.67
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	5	6	16.00
		Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	6	5	6	17.00
		Time Criticality	6	6	7	6.33
		Program Transparency and Reporting	6	5	7	6.00
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	6	5	6	11.33
		Statement of Work	7	5	7	25.33
		Leverage Funding	5	5	6	21.33
		Program Cost-Effectiveness	5	5	6	16.00
		Program Budget	6	5	6	28.33
Total:			228	212	256	232.00

RFP 400-09-403  
SEP Residential  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
8	The San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing	Sustainability/Lasting Changes in the Market	7	8	8	15.33
		Regional Approach	7	8	8	15.33
		Quality Assurance	6	7	6	6.33
		Conformance with California Law	6	7	6	6.33
		Collaboration with national and State Programs	6	8	6	13.33
		Targeting Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	8	8	15.33
		Verification of Energy Savings	6	7	6	6.33
		Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	7	7	7	14.00
		Team Organization Structure	7	7	7	7.00
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	7	8	22.00
		Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	7	8	7	22.00
		Time Criticality	8	8	9	8.33
		Program Transparency and Reporting	7	8	9	8.00
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	7	7	8	14.67
		Statement of Work	8	7	7	29.33
		Leverage Funding	8	7	8	30.67
		Program Cost-Effectiveness	6	6	7	19.00
		Program Budget	8	6	8	36.67
Total:			286	285	299	290.00

RFP 400-09-403  
SEP Residential  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
9	Greener Dawn, Inc.	Sustainability/Lasting Changes in the Market	6	4	5	10.00
		Regional Approach	6	4	4	9.33
		Quality Assurance	6	5	7	6.00
		Conformance with California Law	5	5	6	5.33
		Collaboration with national and State Programs	6	5	6	11.33
		Targeting Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	7	9	15.33
		Verification of Energy Savings	5	5	7	5.67
		Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	5	4	9.33
		Team Organization Structure	4	4	5	4.33
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	5	5	15.00
		Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	4	5	14.00
		Time Criticality	5	5	5	5.00
		Program Transparency and Reporting	4	5	5	4.67
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	4	5	9.33
		Statement of Work	6	6	7	25.33
		Leverage Funding	6	5	4	20.00
		Program Cost-Effectiveness	5	5	3	13.00
		Program Budget	4	4	3	18.33
Total:			212	193	199	201.33

RFP 400-09-403  
SEP Residential  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
10	Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments	Sustainability/Lasting Changes in the Market	5	4	5	9.33
		Regional Approach	6	4	6	10.67
		Quality Assurance	6	4	5	5.00
		Conformance with California Law	5	5	5	5.00
		Collaboration with national and State Programs	5	5	6	10.67
		Targeting Economically Disadvantaged Areas	6	7	8	14.00
		Verification of Energy Savings	6	5	5	5.33
		Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	7	6	7	13.33
		Team Organization Structure	7	5	5	5.67
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	5	5	15.00
		Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	5	6	16.00
		Time Criticality	5	5	4	4.67
		Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	5	5.00
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	6	5	5	10.67
		Statement of Work	7	5	5	22.67
		Leverage Funding	6	4	5	20.00
		Program Cost-Effectiveness	5	4	3	12.00
		Program Budget	7	5	5	28.33
Total:			236	194	210	213.33



RFP 400-09-403  
SEP Residential  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
11	Association of Bay Area Governments	Sustainability/Lasting Changes in the Market	8	8	8	16.00
		Regional Approach	9	8	9	17.33
		Quality Assurance	8	8	8	8.00
		Conformance with California Law	7	7	9	7.67
		Collaboration with national and State Programs	6	8	8	14.67
		Targeting Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	6	6	12.67
		Verification of Energy Savings	8	7	7	7.33
		Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	9	8	8	16.67
		Team Organization Structure	8	8	9	8.33
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	7	7	21.00
		Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	7	7	8	22.00
		Time Criticality	8	7	8	7.67
		Program Transparency and Reporting	8	7	9	8.00
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	9	7	9	16.67
		Statement of Work	8	6	7	28.00
		Leverage Funding	7	7	9	30.67
		Program Cost-Effectiveness	7	7	7	21.00
		Program Budget	6	7	7	33.33
Total:			296	284	311	297.00

RFP 400-09-403  
SEP Residential  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
12	County of Los Angeles	Sustainability/Lasting Changes in the Market	7	7	7	14.00
		Regional Approach	7	6	7	13.33
		Quality Assurance	7	7	8	7.33
		Conformance with California Law	7	7	9	7.67
		Collaboration with national and State Programs	6	7	7	13.33
		Targeting Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	6	5	12.00
		Verification of Energy Savings	7	7	7	7.00
		Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	8	7	7	14.67
		Team Organization Structure	7	6	5	6.00
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	7	7	7	21.00
		Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	6	7	7	20.00
		Time Criticality	7	6	5	6.00
		Program Transparency and Reporting	7	7	7	7.00
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	7	6	6	12.67
		Statement of Work	8	6	6	26.67
		Leverage Funding	7	7	7	28.00
		Program Cost-Effectiveness	7	7	7	21.00
		Program Budget	6	6	5	28.33
Total:			276	263	259	266.00

RFP 400-09-403  
SEP Residential  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
13	SMUD	Sustainability/Lasting Changes in the Market	8	8	9	16.67
		Regional Approach	8	8	9	16.67
		Quality Assurance	8	8	9	8.33
		Conformance with California Law	7	8	9	8.00
		Collaboration with national and State Programs	9	8	9	17.33
		Targeting Economically Disadvantaged Areas	8	7	9	16.00
		Verification of Energy Savings	8	7	9	8.00
		Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	9	8	9	17.33
		Team Organization Structure	8	8	9	8.33
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	8	7	9	24.00
		Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	7	7	8	22.00
		Time Criticality	7	6	7	6.67
		Program Transparency and Reporting	6	7	8	7.00
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	9	8	9	17.33
		Statement of Work	8	7	7	29.33
		Leverage Funding	9	7	9	33.33
		Program Cost-Effectiveness	7	7	8	22.00
		Program Budget	8	7	8	38.33
Total:			320	292	338	316.67

RFP 400-09-403  
SEP Residential  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
14	Regional Council of Rural Counties (CRHMFA Homebuyers Fund)	Sustainability/Lasting Changes in the Market	9	7	9	16.67
		Regional Approach	8	7	9	16.00
		Quality Assurance	7	7	9	7.67
		Conformance with California Law	7	7	9	7.67
		Collaboration with national and State Programs	8	8	9	16.67
		Targeting Economically Disadvantaged Areas	9	8	9	17.33
		Verification of Energy Savings	6	7	7	6.67
		Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	7	6	7	13.33
		Team Organization Structure	8	6	8	7.33
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	8	7	8	23.00
		Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	6	7	6	19.00
		Time Criticality	8	8	9	8.33
		Program Transparency and Reporting	8	7	8	7.67
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	6	6	8	13.33
		Statement of Work	7	7	8	29.33
		Leverage Funding	7	7	7	28.00
		Program Cost-Effectiveness	6	7	6	19.00
		Program Budget	8	7	7	36.67
Total:			294	280	307	293.67

RFP 400-09-403  
SEP Residential  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
15	Amador-Tuolumne Community Action Agency (A-TCAA)	Sustainability/Lasting Changes in the Market	5	3	3	7.33
		Regional Approach	6	4	6	10.67
		Quality Assurance	4	3	5	4.00
		Conformance with California Law	4	3	5	4.00
		Collaboration with national and State Programs	4	3	4	7.33
		Targeting Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	7	9	15.33
		Verification of Energy Savings	4	3	5	4.00
		Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	3	5	8.67
		Team Organization Structure	5	3	4	4.00
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	4	3	4	11.00
		Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	5	5	7	17.00
		Time Criticality	4	3	4	3.67
		Program Transparency and Reporting	5	5	6	5.33
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	3	3	7.33
		Statement of Work	4	4	3	14.67
		Leverage Funding	5	3	4	16.00
		Program Cost-Effectiveness	5	3	5	13.00
		Program Budget	3	3	3	15.00
Total:			183	142	180	168.33

RFP 400-09-403  
SEP Residential  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
16	City of Visalia	Sustainability/Lasting Changes in the Market	4	4	4	8.00
		Regional Approach	6	4	4	9.33
		Quality Assurance	5	5	7	5.67
		Conformance with California Law	5	5	5	5.00
		Collaboration with national and State Programs	4	5	5	9.33
		Targeting Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	7	8	14.67
		Verification of Energy Savings	5	4	6	5.00
		Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	5	6	10.67
		Team Organization Structure	6	4	6	5.33
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	5	4	14.00
		Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	4	5	3	12.00
		Time Criticality	5	4	3	4.00
		Program Transparency and Reporting	4	5	5	4.67
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	4	4	8.67
		Statement of Work	4	3	3	13.33
		Leverage Funding	3	4	2	12.00
		Program Cost-Effectiveness	3	4	4	11.00
		Program Budget	3	4	3	16.67
Total:			171	175	162	169.33

RFP 400-09-403  
SEP Residential  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
17	City of Vacaville	Sustainability/Lasting Changes in the Market	4	4	2	6.67
		Regional Approach	4	4	3	7.33
		Quality Assurance	5	4	3	4.00
		Conformance with California Law	5	4	3	4.00
		Collaboration with national and State Programs	4	4	4	8.00
		Targeting Economically Disadvantaged Areas	5	5	7	11.33
		Verification of Energy Savings	3	4	3	3.33
		Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	4	4	3	7.33
		Team Organization Structure	3	4	3	3.33
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	4	6	4	14.00
		Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	4	4	5	13.00
		Time Criticality	3	4	5	4.00
		Program Transparency and Reporting	4	4	4	4.00
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	5	4	3	8.00
		Statement of Work	4	4	2	13.33
		Leverage Funding	3	4	3	13.33
		Program Cost-Effectiveness	3	4	3	10.00
Program Budget	4	4	2	16.67		
Total:			156	168	131	151.67

RFP 400-09-403  
SEP Residential  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
18	Syzygy Technologies, Inc.	Sustainability/Lasting Changes in the Market	4	3	3	6.67
		Regional Approach	5	3	3	7.33
		Quality Assurance	2	3	3	2.67
		Conformance with California Law	4	3	4	3.67
		Collaboration with national and State Programs	2	3	2	4.67
		Targeting Economically Disadvantaged Areas	7	6	7	13.33
		Verification of Energy Savings	2	3	2	2.33
		Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	5	5	5	10.00
		Team Organization Structure	5	3	4	4.00
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	5	3	3	11.00
		Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	3	3	2	8.00
		Time Criticality	2	2	2	2.00
		Program Transparency and Reporting	3	3	2	2.67
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	2	3	2	4.67
		Statement of Work	2	3	2	9.33
		Leverage Funding	2	2	2	8.00
		Program Cost-Effectiveness	2	3	2	7.00
		Program Budget	3	3	2	13.33
Total:			129	125	108	120.67



RFP 400-09-403  
SEP Residential  
Summary

Prop. #	Company Name	Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Weighted Score
19	Solar Sense, Inc.	Sustainability/Lasting Changes in the Market	0	0	0	0.00
		Regional Approach	0	0	0	0.00
		Quality Assurance	0	0	0	0.00
		Conformance with California Law	0	0	0	0.00
		Collaboration with national and State Programs	0	0	0	0.00
		Targeting Economically Disadvantaged Areas	0	0	0	0.00
		Verification of Energy Savings	0	0	0	0.00
		Participant Recruitment and Program Communication	2	1	1	2.67
		Team Organization Structure	2	1	1	1.33
		Workforce Development and Job Creation	0	0	0	0.00
		Energy, Peak Demand and GHG Emission Reductions	2	1	2	5.00
		Time Criticality	2	1	2	1.67
		Program Transparency and Reporting	0	0	0	0.00
		Program Team Qualifications and Experience	2	1	1	2.67
		Statement of Work	0	0	0	0.00
		Leverage Funding	0	0	0	0.00
		Program Cost-Effectiveness	0	0	0	0.00
		Program Budget	0	0	0	0.00
Total:			18	9	13	13.33