

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL - RML0021**  
**EVALUATION MATRIX**

**UTILITY RATE STUDY, COST OF SERVICE FOR AUSTIN ENERGY**

Component A - Prepare Cost of Service and Rate Design

<b>PROPOSERS NAME:</b>		<b>R.W. Beck, Inc. Austin, TX</b>	<b>Navigant Consulting, Inc. Chicago, IL</b>	<b>Black &amp; Veatch Corp. Overland Park, KS</b>	<b>Concentric Energy Advisors, Inc. Malborough, MA</b>	<b>PA Consulting Group Los Angeles, CA</b>
<b>Evaluation Factors</b>	<b># Possible points</b>					
<b>Project Concept and Solutions and Program Proposed</b> (Grasp of the requirement and its solutions(s), responsiveness to terms and conditions, completeness and thoroughness of the technical data and documentation.).	<b>20</b>	19	17	13	12	15
<b>Demonstrated Applicable Experience of Company</b>	<b>10</b>	9	9	9	6	6
<b>Evidence of Good Organization and Management Practices</b>	<b>10</b>	9	7	5	5	5
<b>Personnel Qualifications and Experience.</b>	<b>15</b>	14	13	13	11	6
<b>Schedule</b> (Thoroughness of Proposer's proposed project schedule and ability to meet proposed implementation date.)	<b>10</b>	8	4	4	4	4
<b>Financial viability/stability</b> (Verifiable evidence of financial strength, including but not limited to: financial ratings, financial statements and other similar documentation.)	<b>5</b>	5	5	0	3	4
<b>Additional applicable resources</b> (software, equipment, facilities, etc.)	<b>5</b>	4	3	3	2	2
<b>Cost Proposal. Total Evaluated Cost.</b> The Proposer with the lowest cost proposed is given the maximum points; a percentage ratio formula is applied to remaining proposers.	<b>25</b>	24	21	25	18	16
<b>Total Points:</b>	<b>100</b>	92	79	72	61	58

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL - RML0021**  
**EVALUATION MATRIX**

**UTILITY RATE STUDY, COST OF SERVICE FOR AUSTIN ENERGY**

Component B - Develop, implement and lead a Public Involvement Communication Plan

<b>PROPOSERS NAME:</b>		<b>R. W. Beck, Inc. Austin, TX</b>	<b>J. Stowe &amp; Co., LLC Austin, TX</b>	<b>Fox Smolen &amp; Associates, Inc. Austin, TX</b>	<b>Diversified Utility Consultants, Inc. Austin, TX</b>
<b>Evaluation Factors</b>	<b># Possible points</b>				
<b>Project Concept and Solutions and Program Proposed</b> (Grasp of the requirement and its solutions(s), responsiveness to terms and conditions, completeness and thoroughness of the technical data and documentation.).	<b>20</b>	18	17	9	8
<b>Demonstrated Applicable Experience of Company</b>	<b>10</b>	7	8	5	2
<b>Evidence of Good Organization and Management Practices</b>	<b>10</b>	8	8	5	5
<b>Personnel Qualifications and Experience.</b>	<b>15</b>	12	12	7	4
<b>Schedule</b> (Thoroughness of Proposer's proposed project schedule and ability to meet proposed implementation date.)	<b>10</b>	8	8	3	3
<b>Financial viability/stability</b> (Verifiable evidence of financial strength, including but not limited to: financial ratings, financial statements and other similar documentation.)	<b>5</b>	4	4	0	0
<b>Additional applicable resources</b> (software, equipment, facilities, etc.)	<b>5</b>	3	3	2	2
<b>Cost Proposal. Total Evaluated Cost.</b> The Proposer with the lowest cost proposed is given the maximum points; a percentage ratio formula is applied to remaining proposers.	<b>25</b>	19	12	25	23
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Interview</b>	<b>25</b>	19	22	N/A	N/A
<b>Total Points:</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>94</b>		

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL - RML0021****Evaluation Matrix****UTILITY RATE STUDY, COST OF SERVICE FOR AUSTIN ENERGY**

Component C - Financial Consultant and Assisting AE as a dedicated financial resource

<b>PROPOSERS NAME:</b>		<b>J. Stowe &amp; Co., LLC Austin, TX</b>	<b>R.W. Beck, Inc. Austin, TX</b>	<b>PA Consulting Group Los Angeles, CA</b>	<b>RJC Energy Consulting Austin, TX</b>	<b>Diversified Utility Consultants, Inc. Austin, TX</b>	<b>Fox Smolen &amp; Associates, Inc. Austin, TX</b>
<b>Evaluation Factors</b>	<b># Possible points</b>						
<b>Project Concept and Solutions and Program Proposed</b> (Grasp of the requirement and its solutions(s), responsiveness to terms and conditions, completeness and thoroughness of the technical data and documentation.).	<b>20</b>	19	10	12	5	6	5
<b>Demonstrated Applicable Experience of Company</b>	<b>10</b>	8	8	6	7	6	5
<b>Evidence of Good Organization and Management Practices</b>	<b>10</b>	9	8	7	4	4	3
<b>Personnel Qualifications and Experience.</b>	<b>15</b>	13	12	7	13	4	6
<b>Schedule</b> (Thoroughness of Proposer's proposed project schedule and ability to meet proposed implementation date.)	<b>10</b>	8	8	5	3	2	3
<b>Financial viability/stability</b> (Verifiable evidence of financial strength, including but not limited to: financial ratings, financial statements and other similar documentation.)	<b>5</b>	4	4	4	0	0	0
<b>Additional applicable resources</b> (software, equipment, facilities, etc.)	<b>5</b>	4	3	3	3	1	2
<b>Cost Proposal. Total Evaluated Cost.</b> The Proposer with the lowest cost proposed is given the maximum points; a percentage ratio formula is applied to remaining proposers.	<b>25</b>	21	20	14	17	25	22
<b>Total Points:</b>	<b>100</b>	86	73	58	52	49	46