

**Pinellas County
WTE Facility Operator Reprocurement
Proposal Evaluation
Composite Score**

Proposer	C	SPTP	HP	Composite Scores
Covanta	9.32	8.62	9.15	9.24
Montenay	10.00	9.21	9.40	9.86
Wheelabrator	8.43	8.72	8.70	8.48

Composite Score = 0.8 C + 0.1 SPTP + 0.1 HP

Where:

C = Cost Score

SPTP = (Normalized Staffing Plan Score plus Normalized Transition Plan Score) divided by two

HP = Normalized Historical Performance Score

SIGNATURE: _____
ROBERT HAUSER

SIGNATURE: _____
MICHAEL SWEET

SIGNATURE: _____
ROBERT BRUMBACK

SIGNATURE: _____
KELSI OSWALD

SIGNATURE: _____
BETH WININGER

Date: December 5, 2006

**Pinellas County
WTE Facility Operator Reprocurement
Proposal Evaluation Worksheet
Cost**

Proposer	Proposal NPV	Lowest NPV Divided By Proposer's NPV	Cost Scores
Covanta	\$ 217,500,387.00	\$ 0.93	\$ 9.32
Montenay	\$ 202,815,200.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 10.00
Wheelabrator	\$ 240,660,954.00	\$ 0.84	\$ 8.43

Score for the Lowest NPV = 10

Score for the Second Lowest NPV = (Lowest NPV divided by Second Lowest NPV),
with the result multiplied by 10 and rounded to two decimal places

Score for the Third Lowest NPV = (Lowest NPV divided by Third Lowest NPV),
with the result multiplied by 10 and rounded to two decimal places

**Pinellas County
WTE Facility Operator
Proposal Evaluation Worksheet
Consensus Matrix**

Excellent = 10 - 8

Date Of Review: December 5, 2006

Good = 7 - 6

Average = 5

Below Average = 4 - 3

Poor = 2 - 0

Criteria	Total Averaged Raw Score for Covanta	Total Averaged Raw Score for Montenay	Total Averaged Raw Score for Wheelabrator
Staffing Plan	60.6	63.4	63.2
Transition Plan	68.6	74.8	67.2
Historical Performance	36.6	37.6	34.8

Criteria	Normalized Score for Covanta	Normalized Score for Montenay	Normalized Score for Wheelabrator	Normalizing Formula
Staffing Plan	8.66	9.06	9.03	Normalized Staffing Plan Score = Total Averaged Raw Score divided by Maximum Score of seventy (70), with the result multiplied by 10 and rounded to two decimal places (Staffing & Transition Plans are equally weighted)
Transition Plan	8.58	9.35	8.40	Normalized Transition Plan Score = Total Averaged Raw Score divided by Maximum Score of eighty (80), with the result multiplied by 10 and rounded to two decimal places (Staffing & Transition Plans are equally weighted)
Historical Performance	9.15	9.40	8.70	Normaized Historical Performance = Total Averaged Raw Score divided by the Maximum Score of forty (40), with the result multiplied by 10 and rounded to two decimal places

SIGNATURE: _____
ROBERT HAUSER

SIGNATURE: _____
MICHAEL SWEET

SIGNATURE: _____
ROBERT BRUMBACK

SIGNATURE: _____
KELSI OSWALD

SIGNATURE: _____
BETH WININGER

**Pinellas County
WTE Facility Operator Reprocurement
Proposal Evaluation Master Matrix**

	Hauser			Oswald			Sweet			Wininger			Brumback		
	Covanta	Montenay	Wheelabrator	Covanta	Montenay	Wheelabrator	Covanta	Montenay	Wheelabrator	Covanta	Montenay	Wheelabrator	Covanta	Montenay	Wheelabrator
Staffing Plan Evaluation Criteria															
a) How staff will be deployed to ensure reliable operation of the Facility	9	9	9	10	9	10	10	9	10	10	9	10	8	8	8
b) The proposed management structure	9	9	9	8	10	8	9	9	9	8	9	9	8	8	8
c) The proposed organization chart and job descriptions	8	9	8	8	10	10	9	10	9	8	10	10	8	8	8
d) Full-time and part-time positions	9	9	9	10	9	8	10	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	8
e) Proposed contracted services	8	9	9	8	8	10	8	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	8
f) The qualifications of the proposed Facility Manager and other named employees	9	10	10	8	10	9	10	10	10	9	10	9	8	8	9
g) Proposed staff skills, training, certifications, and safety requirements	8	9	10	8	10	10	9	9	9	9	10	9	8	8	8
Total Staffing Plan Raw Score	60	64	64	60	66	65	65	65	65	62	66	65	56	56	57

Scoring: Excellent = 10 - 8, Good = 7 - 6, Average = 5, Below Average = 4 - 3, Poor = 2 - 0

**Pinellas County
WTE Facility Operator Reprocurement
Proposal Evaluation Master Matrix**

	Hauser			Oswald			Sweet			Wininger			Brumback		
	Covanta	Montenay	Wheelabrator	Covanta	Montenay	Wheelabrator	Covanta	Montenay	Wheelabrator	Covanta	Montenay	Wheelabrator	Covanta	Montenay	Wheelabrator

Transition Plan Evaluation Criteria															
a) Plans for job assignments and responsibilities	9	9	9	10	10	9	9	9	9	10	10	9	8	8	8
b) Employee training objectives and plans	9	10	9	10	9	9	10	10	10	9	10	10	8	9	8
c) Draft protocol required by Section 3.4.4(b)(ii) of the Service Agreement	9	9	9	9	10	9	9	10	10	8	10	9	8	9	8
d) Emergency plan required by Section 3.8 of the Service Agreement	9	9	8	9	9	8	9	9	8	9	10	8	8	9	8
e) Plan to comply with the Power Purchase Agreement pursuant to Section 3.28 of the Service Agreement	8	9	9	8	10	9	8	10	10	9	10	9	8	9	9
f) The draft of the hazardous waste contingency plan (HWCP) required by Section 7.3.2.2 of the Service Agreement;	9	10	8	9	10	8	9	9	8	9	10	8	8	8	8
g) Plan to deliver minus 5 inch Residue to the County while the RSPB is being constructed	7	8	6	7	9	6	7	9	6	7	9	7	7	9	6
h) Plan for removing the water that has accumulated in the storage pit	9	9	9	9	10	9	9	10	9	9	10	9	8	8	8
Total Transition Plan Raw Score	69	73	67	71	77	67	70	76	70	70	79	69	63	69	63

Scoring: Excellent = 10 - 8, Good = 7 - 6, Average = 5, Below Average = 4 - 3, Poor = 2 - 0

**Pinellas County
WTE Facility Operator Reprocurement
Proposal Evaluation Master Matrix**

	Hauser			Oswald			Sweet			Wininger			Brumback		
	Covanta	Montenay	Wheelabrator	Covanta	Montenay	Wheelabrator	Covanta	Montenay	Wheelabrator	Covanta	Montenay	Wheelabrator	Covanta	Montenay	Wheelabrator

Historical Performance Evaluation Criteria															
a) Regulatory compliance records at all waste-to-energy facilities operated by the Proposer or affiliates of the Proposer using ECHO data	10	10	10	9	10	9	9	10	8	9	10	9	8	8	8
b) Health and safety history at all waste-to-energy facilities operated by the Proposer or affiliates of the Proposer	10	10	10	9	9	9	10	10	10	9	10	9	8	9	8
c) Client references at all publicly owned waste-to-energy facilities operated by the Proposer or affiliates or the Proposer (This criteria is weighted at fifty percent (50%) of the Historical Performance Criteria. Therefore, the raw score for this criteria is multiplied by 2 in determining the Total Historical Performance Raw Score.)	9	9	8	10	9	8	9	10	9	9	9	8	9	9	9
Total Historical Performance Raw Score	38	38	36	38	37	34	37	40	36	36	38	34	34	35	34

Scoring: Excellent = 10 - 8, Good = 7 - 6, Average = 5, Below Average = 4 - 3, Poor = 2 - 0