City of FRESNO

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Fresno Area Express | Q | Handy Ride

SELECTION COMMITTEE REPORT

FOR

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS NO. 12502230

MANAGEMENT OF LCFS/RIN CREDIT PROGRAMS AND SUPPLY OF RNG

February 2026

Prepared by:

Stefanee Ramirez, Management Analyst II
Department of Transportation / Fresno Area Express
2223 G Street
Fresno, CA 93706

Selection Committee Sign-Off

The following Selection Committee voting members have read the enclosed report and concur with the findings as written:

1/28/26

Analicia Jesse
Senior Management Analyst
Department of Transportation

Eudelia Rios
Safety and Training Specialist
Department of Transportation

Richard Baldon
Project Manager
Department of Transportation

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Transportation / Fresno Area Express (FAX) owns, operates, and maintains a Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) fueling facility. Delivery of uncompressed natural gas is currently being provided on-demand through Pacific Gas and Electric's (PG&E's) service lines to FAX's CNG station. The CNG station serves to fuel FAX's bus fleet of over 138 buses, most of which are CNG-powered. It also provides CNG fuel to other City departments and external customers.

On April 16, 2025, FAX published a Request for Proposals (RFP) seeking a qualified consultant to manage the generation, sale, and reporting of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) and Renewable Identification Number (RIN) credits derived from the agency's CNG fueling operations. Additionally, the consultant will be responsible for coordinating the resupply of renewable natural gas (RNG).

The Selection Committee evaluated the proposals based upon five categories:

- Share of Revenue: [30%]
- Credit Monetization: [30%]
- Qualifications, Related Experience, and References: [20%]
- Completeness of Response: [15%]
- Fees: [5%]

On May 22, 2025, FAX received six (6) proposals which were reviewed and deliberated by the Selection Committee. The results of the Selection Committee's evaluation are as follows:

OVERALL SCORING					
Anew RNG	**Clean Energy**	**Maas Energy**	**STX**	**Love's**	**U.S. Energy**
75.72	81.83	87.62	94.55	71.23	83.68

The Selection Committee unanimously recommends STX Commodities for award of a contract for LCFS/RIN Management and Supply because they received the highest average score.

II. COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Sharlee Flores	Committee Chair (Non-Voting)
Analicia Jesse	Committee Member (Voting)
Eudelia Rios	Committee Member (Voting)
Richard Baldon	Committee Member (Voting)
Stefanee Ramirez	Advisor (Non-Voting)
Orie Rubalcava	Advisor (Non-Voting)
Joana Garcia	Advisor (Non-Voting)

III. SIGNIFICANT EVENTS

April 16, 2025 – Solicitation Posted

April 28, 2025 – Pre-proposal Conference

May 22, 2025 – Proposals Due

June 11, 2025 – Selection Committee Meeting

June 17, 2025 – Selection Committee Meeting

IV. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Selection Committee evaluated the proposals based on five (5) categories:

Share of Revenue: [30%]

The reasonableness and competitiveness of the revenue sharing in connection with services rendered to FAX, the adequacy of source data and information provided to support cost quotes and figures. This includes assessment of the percentage split for LCFS and RIN credit revenue and the use of industry recognized measurement when compiling the revenue. The proposed revenue sharing structure will be evaluated to ensure that FAX receives the maximum financial benefit from monetization of credits generated from our fueling.

Credit Monetization: [30%]

The Proposer's ability to demonstrate the last three (3) years of credit transaction history and future projections, as requested in in the Proposers Qualifications Questionnaire (page 16, question 13), which efficiently monetizes LCFS and RIN credits that results in superior market returns at competitive fee rates, delivering maximum revenue return to FAX.

Qualifications, Related Experience, and References: [20%]

Technical experience in performing work of a closely similar nature; experience working with public agencies; experience in providing specifically this type of service, strength and stability of the firm; stability, experience, and technical competence of sub-consultants; assessment by client references; references with demonstrated success in providing similar services.

Completeness of Response: [15%]

Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions; exceptions to or deviations from the RFP requirements that the Agency cannot or will not accommodate; and any other relevant factors not considered elsewhere.

Fees: [5%]

The reasonableness and competitiveness of the fees charged by the proposer for managing and administering the hydrogen electric fuel and electric vehicle charging credit generation and monetization.

The criteria scoring is as follows:

SHARE OF REVENUE		
Proposer	**Comments**	**Criteria Score**
Anew RNG	Proposed the highest revenue share of LCFS and RIN credits and a sufficient CI rating. Has an LCFS fee that varied depending on the market sale for electric and hydrogen credits.	28.50
Clean Energy	Clean Energy proposed the highest Electric and Hydrogen Electric Fuel fees per credit with a 0% LCFS revenue sharing for the CNG fuel. Evaluators noted it as one of the least financially beneficial options. The lack of LCFS revenue sharing and high service fees made it less favorable overall.	24.10
Maas Energy	Proposed a competitive revenue share for incremental LCFS credits and RIN credits and offered the lowest CI.	27.70
STX Commodities	STX presented the highest revenue-sharing percentages and does not charge for monetizing EV or hydrogen credits. All Committee Members scored this vendor the highest, citing its cost sharing and value to FAX.	29.30

Love's Alternative Energy	Proposal was one of the lower of share of revenue received for the LCFS/RIN CNG management as well as one of the highest fees per credit to manage the Electric and Hydrogen Electric fuel credits.	24.30
U.S Energy	Offered a strong LCFS credit share and RIN credit values. The proposal had strengths, but was scored average by the Committee Members in this evaluation criteria.	26.70

CREDIT MONETIZATION		
Proposer	**Comments**	**Criteria Score**
Anew RNG	Anew RNG provided five-year projections totaling a significant amount, but did not provide the required three-year historical data. This impacted the proposal's scoring.	18.50
Clean Energy	Clean Energy submitted most of the required information and had a solid five-year projection.	26.20
Maas Energy	Maas Energy submitted a complete three-year history and competitive annual projections over five years. While well-documented, the projected return was slightly below the top vendors.	26.90
STX Commodities	STX provided a complete three-year history of credit monetization and a positive 5-year future projection, which was the highest of all proposals.	27.60
Love's Alternative Energy	Love's provided some of the required documents, but did not demonstrate the last three years of credit transaction history. Provided the highest CI and the lowest projection of all proposals.	16.80
U.S Energy	The three-year credit sales data submitted specified inaccurate market reflections. While the five-year projection is favorable, it represents a median estimate among the proposals received.	21.70

QUALIFICATIONS, RELATED EXPERIENCE, AND REFERENCES		
Proposer	**Comments**	**Criteria Score**
Anew RNG	Presented relevant experience and provided references; however, they could not be reached for verification.	16.33
Clean Energy	Provided adequate technical experience supported by multiple references, two of which responded positively. Their ranking reflected solid qualifications.	17.73
Maas Energy	Recognized for strong qualifications, they submitted references from three California cities, with positive feedback from one. Their technical depth contributed to higher scoring for this criterion.	18.47
STX Commodities	Demonstrated valid technical experience and past performance such as two credible city agencies used as references with positive responses, which strengthened their proposal.	18.20
Love's Alternative Energy	Provided references; however, they could not be reached for verification.	15.73
U.S Energy	Received the highest scoring due to their strong technical experience and relevant work with transit agencies, supported by positive reference responses.	18.87

COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE		
Proposer	**Comments**	**Criteria Score**
Anew RNG	Question 2 of the Qualification Questionnaire is incomplete; the proposer did not provide the extent of staff involvement in the performance of this contract.	12.40
Clean Energy	Received high scoring for overall completeness, with only minor omissions noted.	13.80
Maas Energy	Submitted a mostly complete proposal, though some minor details were not submitted.	14.55

STX Commodities	Minor gaps were noted, but did not detract significantly from the overall strength of their submission.	14.45
Love's Alternative Energy	Omitted essential data and staff responsibilities were unclear, which influenced their scoring.	12.40
U.S Energy	Key personnel were submitted, however, the requested project involvement details regarding key personnel are not listed.	12.10

FEES

The scoring for fees was based on the lowest price in relation to the offered price. The formula is as follows:

$$\text{Fee Score} = \frac{\text{lowest fee}}{\text{offered fee}} \times 5$$

The results are as follows:

Anew RNG – 0

Clean Energy – 0

Maas Energy – 0

STX Commodities – 5

Love's Alternative Energy – 0

U.S Energy – 0

Due to one proposer offering a fee of $0, the ratio of all submissions in comparison to the lowest offer calculates points only to the lowest offer.

The overall scores for the proposals are as follows:

OVERALL SCORING					
Anew RNG	**Clean Energy**	**Maas Energy**	**STX**	**Love's**	**U.S. Energy**
75.72	81.83	87.62	94.55	71.23	83.68

V. NEGOTIATIONS

FAX conducted contract negotiations with multiple vendors. The negotiations with STX, the selected vendor, resulted in revisions to contract language, effective dates, terms and conditions, and registration fees.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

After independent evaluation of the proposals and group deliberation, the Selection Committee determined that STX Commodities meets the interest of the City and the objectives of the project. The Committee recommends awarding a two-year service contract, with options for three one-year extensions to STX Commodities.