Appendix J – Evaluation Methodology and Scorecard

JEA reserves the right to adjust evaluation criteria or weighting before the response due date. Any modification of response evaluation criteria will be posted via an addendum.

Economic Evaluation
The quantitative assessment is inclusive of economic analysis that measures the cumulative present worth cost (CPWC) over a 30-year horizon, consistent with the expected life of a new-build CCGT. The economic analysis will utilize information in the Responses to characterize the cost of the proposed resource. The proposed resource will be evaluated using the PLEXOS capacity expansion and production cost models.

The PLEXOS model inputs will be fixed prior to opening Responses within the Solicitation and will be used consistently throughout the evaluation of the Responses and the self-build option, including fuel price forecasts, load forecast, existing unit characteristics, candidate (new) unit characteristics, clean energy requirements, and required reserve margin.

JEA will use the PLEXOS LT model to develop an optimal capacity expansion plan for each proposed resource for under each of these scenarios and sensitivities listed below.

a. Reference case which assumes the EPA's Greenhouse Gas Rule is in place and effective (across 30 years and 15 years)
b. Sensitivity without the EPA's Greenhouse Gas Rule in place
c. High load forecast sensitivity
d. Low load forecast sensitivity
e. High gas price sensitivity

Under each of these sensitivities and scenarios the JEA system will be optimized around the proposed resource. Through this process, planning objectives will be met within reason, including clean energy goals, dump energy levels, unserved energy, unit capacity factors, starts, operating hours, unit costs.

In the economic evaluation, Responses will be ranked based on minimizing the CPWC of serving JEA load over the planning horizon. Responses with a low CPWC will receive a higher score than Responses with a higher CPWC.

Credit Evaluation
JEA has included detailed credit requirements in Appendix G – Credit Requirements and has specified the information required to evaluate credit requirements in Section 11- Financing of Appendix F – Respondent Questionnaire.

JEA will perform a credit analysis to determine whether the issuing entities are creditworthy to support the Seller's credit assurance obligations. The creditworthiness of the entity providing the applicable instrument will be based on the reasonable judgment of JEA, provided that any entity with a short-term or long-term investment grade credit rating by S&P, Fitch, or Moody's shall be deemed to have acceptable financial creditworthiness.

Transmission Evaluation

All applicable Response requirements relative to Transmission and Interconnection are contained in Appendix B – Transmission Interconnection and Deliverability Considerations, and identified narratives and information for Responses are in Section 8 – Interconnection and Delivery of Appendix F – Respondent Questionnaire. Each Response will be evaluated based on the narrative descriptions and data requested in the subject appendices. The evaluation process is described as follows:

- JEA will review all the transmission system impact studies, results and narrative descriptions submitted as part of the Response. If insufficient information is provided, JEA will request further clarifications or initiate its own study as needed to evaluate the Response. JEA also reserves the right to reject significantly incomplete or non-compliant Responses.
- Categories to be evaluated include the following:
    - Reliability and Risk of proposed transmission / interconnection
    - Transmission company and/or consulting engineering contractor's experience level;
    - Complexity, Cost and Schedule Reasonableness of required upgrades.
    - Risks and Mitigation of impacts to JEA's existing import and export capability and to reliability and performance of the JEA system
- The criteria for the basis of JEA's present import/export capability will be analyzed (by JEA) according to standard methods and furnished to the IE prior to receipt of Market RFP Responses. JEA's current system with and without JEA's self-build resource will be analyzed for 2030/2031 Winter and 2031 summer peak load conditions to determine these values. The same planned system for the above years and seasons with the resource proposed by the Respondents substituted for the JEA self-build resource will also be analyzed for transmission impacts to determine how JEA's import/export capacity may be impacted.
- Note that any network resource must be evaluated at the same queue position as JEA's proposed self-build option.

Fuel Supply Evaluation

JEA will evaluate fuel supply information provided in Section 10 – Fuel Supply and Transportation of Appendix F - Respondent Questionnaire. JEA's primary focus for this evaluation includes:

- Reliability –JEA will evaluate the potential reliability, cost risk and construction risk of the Respondent's fuel plan by looking at the following:
    - Existing pipelines serving facility will be viewed as providing less risk than new pipelines.
    - Where new pipelines are required, risk will be assessed by how well Respondent demonstrates that there is a reasonable possibility of successful permitting and construction.
    - Source(s) of natural gas transportation should be a liquid and accessible location.
- Optionality – Firm transportation and/or firm delivered commodity contracts should be designed to cost effectively deliver fuel with primary firm reliability, in order to meet firm energy delivery requirements. The coverage needed to achieve this is left to the Respondent to propose, and might include means of firming gas supply such as firm interstate gas transportation contracts and/or firm delivered commodity contracts or equivalent arrangements. Responses including options that will allow for optimization of

transportation assets as well as any gas commodity supply deals when not required to serve load will achieve a higher rating.

- Diversity – Consideration will be given for fuel supply sources that expand the current supply basins that JEA accesses. For example, options to move further upstream with transportation assets that access more liquid supply basins and receipt points. JEA is typically accessing Texas/Gulf and Appalachian shale basins at present.

JEA Solicitation Scorecard

JEA reserves the right to adjust the qualitative criteria and point assignment prior to receipt of offers.

Total Scoring Methodology

Metric	Max Points	Max Score	If not least cost
Economic Assessment Scoring	**70**		
Lowest Overall CPWC, Base Case (with GHG Rule) 30 Years	30	Lowest cost CPWC over 30 year planning period	30 Points less plan's percentage above least cost CPWC plan
Lowest CPWC, Base Case (with GHG Rule) at 15 year mark	10	Lowest cost CPWC after 15 year planning period	15 Points less plan's percentage above least cost CPWC plan
Lowest Overall CPWC, Base Case (without GHG Rule) 30 Yea	15	Lowest cost CPWC over 30 year planning period	15 Points less plan's percentage above least cost CPWC plan
Sensitivity Cases CPWC	15	Lowest average cost CPWC across sensitivities	15 Points less plan's percentage above least cost CPWC plan
Risk Assessment	**30**	Criteria outlined below in scorecard	
System Reliability (Flexibility)	6		
Experience and Commercial	4.5		
Transmission Status	6		
Project Status and Technical Design	3		
Environmental	4.5		
Fuel Supply	6		
Total Score	**100**		

Risk Assessment Scorecard

Metric	Weighting	Score Definition: 0-5	Score Definition: 6-10	Score Definition: 11-15
System Reliability (Flexibility)	**20%**			
Start Time (cold start) to MECL (hours)	15%	Over 8 hours	6-8 hours	6 hours or less
Start Time (Warm) to MECL (minutes)	20%	Over 85 minutes	75-85 minutes	75 minutes or less
Maximum Hours Qualifying to Full Load as Warm Start	15%	Over 4.5 hours	4 - 4.5 hours	4 hours or less
Starts Per year limitation	15%	Less than 50	>=50 but less than 150	>=150
CT Ramp Rate (CT Only, with steam cycle in service if CC)	15%	<40MW/Min MECL to MCR	>=40MW/Min, <60MW/Min MECL to MCR	>= 60MW/Min MECL to MCR
Continuous Minimum Dispatch Level (MECL)	20%	>35% of unfired MCR	<=35%, >25% of unfired MCR	<=25% of unfired MCR
Total Score	**100%**			

Metric	Weighting	Score Definition: 0-5	Score Definition: 6-10	Score Definition: 11-15
Experience and Commercial	**15%**			
Commercial Terms	20%	Did not provide proposed terms, or the terms allocated significant risk to Buyer	Proposed term sheet reflects a balanced allocation of risk between Buyer and Seller	Proposed term sheet is consistent with JEA preferred contract terms.
Respondent's Development Experience	30%	Respondent has completed zero projects of the same proposed technology (i.e. CCGT) and that is at least 75% of the proposed capacity (for a single unit)	Respondent has completed at least 1 project, but less than 3 projects, of the same proposed technology and that are at least 75% of the proposed capacity (for a single unit)	Respondent has completed 3 or more projects of the same proposed technology that are at least 75% of the proposed capacity (for a single unit), or the Response is for an existing resource.
Company's Operational Experience	30%	Respondent has owned and operated less than 3 facilities with the proposed fuel-types.	Respondent has owned and operated at least 3 but less than 6 facilities with the same fuel type as the proposes resource.	Respondent has owned and operated at least 6 facilities with the same fuel-type as proposed, or the proposed resource will be operated by JEA.
Safety and Performance of Similar Units	20%	Respondent has no Safety Standards or has not provided adequate documentation, or their standards have significant deficiencies. Or Respondent has a total recordable incident (TRI) level higher than the TRI for their industry as determined by the U.S. Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA).	Respondent has provided Safety Standards, but they have some deficiencies in the standards. And Respondent has a total recordable incident (TRI) level lower than or equal to the TRI for their industry as determined by the U.S. Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA).	Respondent has provided Safety Standards consistent with expectations, and these standards will be applicable to any contractors. And Respondent has a total recordable incident (TRI) level lower than or equal to the TRI for their industry as determined by the U.S. Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA).
Total Score	**100%**			

Metric	Weighting	Score Definition: 0-5	Score Definition: 6-10	Score Definition: 11-15
Transmission Status	**20%**			
Reliability and Risk of transmission solution compared with proposed self-build project	35%	Power delivery via transmission service with multiple transmission providers, or interconnection within JEA system with significant negative impacts to JEA system	Power delivery via transmission service with one service provider, or interconnection within JEA system with some negative impacts	Directly interconnected within JEA system, no negative impacts to JEA system, reliability and risk equivalent to self-build project
Quality of Proposer's and/or Proposer's engineering contractor's experience with developing, evaluating and executing transmission upgrades in the respective (FRCC/ITS) region(s) as applicable	20%	Minimal to no experience with developing, evaluating and executing transmission upgrades	Experienced with developing, evaluating and executing transmission upgrades, but in only one (FRCC or ITS) region	No upgrades required, or very experienced with developing, evaluating and executing transmission upgrades in the applicable (FRCC/ITS) region(s)
Project Upgrades Cost & Complexity (Total Project Cost = Transmission + Interconnection + 3rd Party Impacts + JEA impacts (as determined by JEA study))	15%	Significant projects were identified (Total Project Cost >$50M) or projects are not expected to be in-service by COD, or proposal failed to adequately address necessary transmission/interconnection, 3rd party upgrades	Some projects ($25M< Total Project Cost <=$50M) were identified with no expected impact to project schedule	Total Project Cost <= $25M and no expected impact to COD
Risk of Transmisison construction project(s) not meeting the PPA In-Service Date	15%	Identified projects contain significant risks, or trigger regulation under the Florida TLSA or FERC Order No. 1000	Identified projects are more extensive (Total Project Cost > $25M, or some impact expected on the COD) but do not trigger regulation under Florida TLSA or FERC Order No. 1000	Total Project Cost <= $25M, No TLSA/FERC Order No. 1000 and no expected impact to COD
Risk of 3rd party impacts	15%	Major 3rd party impact projects (>$20M required, or no assessment of 3rd party impacts, or inadequate methodology for assessment of 3rd party impacts at any cost level	Minor 3rd party impact projects identified with adequate assessment of projects	No 3rd party impacts, adequate assessment shows zero 3rd party impact cost
Total Score	**100%**			

Metric	Weighting	Score Definition: 0-5	Score Definition: 6-10	Score Definition: 11-15
Project Status and Technical Design	**10%**			
Project Design and Cost Estimate Status	25%	Response based on a planning estimate, or did not provide enough information to assess.	Response is based on a Class 4 or 5 estimate	Response is based on a level 3 estimate, or the Response is for an existing resource.
Project Development Schedule	20%	Timeline provides only a high level of detail or timeline does not support the proposed COD.	Timeline provides sufficient detail to confirm achievable milestone dates, the critical path, and any owner-furnished obligations that support the stated COD.	Timeline provides additional detail beyond critical path items and key milestone dates, and supports the stated COD, or the Response is for an existing resource.
EPC Contract Status	10%	Documentation indicates that no long-lead time equipment (e.g., transformers) and EPC contracts have been established and/or suppliers have not been identified	Documentation indicates that long-lead time equipment (e.g., transformers) and EPC contracts have been identified.	Documentation indicates that long-lead time equipment (e.g., transformers) and EPC contracts are have been idenitifed and are in negotiations, or master supply arrangements/ agreements exist, or the Response is for an existing resource.
Site Control	25%	Respondent provided no documentation to support site control	Respondent is in negotiations (e.g., has an LOI) for all or a portion of the site and required easements, or has site control for only a portion of the required site plan.	Respondent has full site control with an executed agreement, or the Response is for an existing resource.
Financing Plan	10%	Respondent has not provided a comprehensive financing plan, or has not indicate engagement with financing entities.	Respondent has made progress in financing project, including engagement with applicable financing entities.	A detailed financing plan has been provided as part of the Response and it is determined to be realistic to keep project development on track, or the Response is for an existing resource, or the resource is owned by JEA.
Staffing and O&M Plan	10%	Respondent did not provide a comprehensive O&M and staffing plan	Respondent provided an O&M & staffing plan consistent with development stage of the project	Respondent provided a comprehensive staffing & O&M plan, or the resource will be operated by JEA.
Total Score	**100%**			

Metric	Weighting	Score Definition: 0-5	Score Definition: 6-10	Score Definition: 11-15
Environmental	**15%**			
Permit Matrix	10%	Respondent has not provided a permit matrix and associated schedule for permitting.	Respondent provided a permit matrix but did not include all appropriate permits and/or a realistic schedule for obtaining the permits.	Respondent provided a permit matrix outlining all of the appropriate permits needed and a realistic schedule for obtaining the permits.
Regulatory, Permitting and Environmental Studies and Plans Impact Severity	40%	Studies and Plans reflect significant undue permitting, schedule, remediation or cost risks or schedule challenges, or the Response is for an existing resource.	Studies and Plans reflect minor undue permitting, schedule, remediation or cost risks or schedule challenges, or the Response is for an existing resource.	Studies and Plans reflect no undue permitting, schedule, remediation or cost, risks or schedule challenges, or the Response is for an existing resource.
Greenhouse Gas Rule Compliance	50%	Proposed asset is subject to the GHG rule, but not in compliance with the rule, or no compliance strategy mentioned.	Proposed asset is subject to GHG rule and in compliance with the rule via proposed CCS included in pricing and schedule.	Proposed asset is subject to the GHG rule and compliance via specified capacity factor limitation and emission rate cap are proposed without impacting flexibility requirements, or proposed asset is not subject to the GHG rule.
Total Score	**100%**			

Metric	Weighting	Score Definition: 0-5	Score Definition: 6-10	Score Definition: 11-15
Fuel Supply	**20%**			
Maturity of fuel supply plan	25%	Respondent has not engaged with gas companies/pipelines for fuel supply.	Respondent has developed a fuel supply plan, and has had preliminary discussions with pipelines.	Respondent has formal engagements with pipelines to provide fuel to proposed facility, or the Response is for an existing resource.
Number of fuel sources (Available pipelines from different supply basings) for primary fuel (natural gas)	25%	There is a single fuel source for the facility.	There are two fuel sources for the facility.	There are more than 2 fuel sources for the facility.
Firm Fuel Transportation Availability	25%	Firm gas supply is not adequate to limit use of backup fuel to extreme winter peaks or during gas supply emergencies.	Firm gas supply is adequate to limit use of backup fuel to extreme winter peaks or during gas supply emergencies	Firm gas supply is adequate to requre no backup fuel use to meet system peaks except during gas supply emergencies.
Flexibility in fuel scheduling	25%	Terms of fuel contracts are unknown.	Fuel contracts require day-ahead scheduling.	Fuel contracts allow for intra-day scheduling and options for re-delivery.
Total Score	**100%**			