

Questions Received and Responses for:  
Request for Proposals for Joint CCA Integrated Resource Plan Consulting Services

**Q1:** Can the proposal due date be extended? A response lead time of 7-9 business days is very short considering the proposal must include a detailed understanding of each CCA and the CPUC's evolving IRP planning process and the tools that must be used, and must include multiple pricing options (Conforming, Alternative, fixed fee per CCA for disaggregation, fixed or T&M per CCA for support of an IRP by each of them). The work scope is relatively new, performed only once before (2018) by E3. Such a short time frame and complexity favors the incumbent consultant (E3) who has strong pre-existing knowledge of these issues.

**A1:** The due date will be extended by one week. The new due date is August 19, 2019 at 5:00 PM PDT.

**Q2:** This RFP specifically refers to SERVM and Plexos, could we use equivalent production cost modeling software like AAB's e7?

**A2:** The Joint CCAs would consider equivalent production cost modeling software provided that the results are compatible with the CPUC's IRP modeling and can be used to provide input on CPUC modeling efforts, and to accurately populate the CPUC IRP templates for the individual CCAs.

**Q3a:** The Excel Report detailing the performance of the Joint IRP specifies this should include "rate results". Could you please clarify the meaning of rate result – is this total resource cost, cost per kilowatt-hour (kWh), cost per kWh by customer class or some other metric.

**A3a:** Total resource cost and cost per kilowatt-hour.

**Q3b:** If disaggregated by customer class or another metric, will the CCAs provide the classifications?

**Q3b:** Not applicable.

**Q4:** Requires a "Reliability/ renewable integration needs" assessment. As each CCA may have different requirements based on their individual portfolios, is this intended for the joint portfolio or the individual CCA portfolios?

**A4:** Both.

**Q5:** Requires a "Dashboard enabling sensitivity analysis". [Proposer] assumes this is intended to allow users to easily change a portfolio and develop estimates of portfolio energy metrics. Please clarify the expected functionality of this requirement and specify the assumptions that be included for the sensitivity analysis.

**A5:** The Joint CCAs have not developed a detailed list of assumptions that should be capable of being varied. Proposer may provide estimates in light of the ability to test sensitivities using the

particular parameters identified by the Proposer. The Joint CCAs would welcome having choices (a low cost option with the ability to vary a smaller number of key assumptions, and one or more potentially more costly options with the ability to vary a larger number of assumptions).

**Q6:** Scope of Work Item 6 requires the Consultant to “Participate in external stakeholder meetings and provide iterations to Joint IRP models”. [Proposer] understands the PPAs have governing boards and stakeholder procurement committees that advise the CCAs on planning and procurement issues, as well as external stakeholders that CCAs are working with. Please elaborate on the expectation for this task, including the projected number of stakeholder meetings, whether these are held by webinar or in-person, and the anticipated external stakeholders.

**A6:** For purposes of the proposal, assume three external meetings to take place in the context of the CPUC’s IRP proceeding with CPUC staff and key stakeholders. Please provide alternatives for additional meetings to be paid on a time and materials basis.

**Q7:** Do the CCAs plan on executing a single contract with the Contractor or will the Contractor execute contracts with each CCA for their pro-rata portion of the project?

**A7:** The Contractor will enter into a single contract with one of the CCAs. The additional CCAs will separately enter into cost-sharing agreements with that CCA.

**Q8:** Will the selected Consultant contract with one of the CCAs, or some joint agency representing the Joint CCAs, or all of the CCAs individually?

**A8:** Please see A6.

**Q9:** What was the dollar amount of the services performed by the consultant for the 2018 IRPs?

**A9:** A joint IRP for several CCAs has never been performed before. The 2018 IRPs were completed by each CCA and their individual consultants.

**Q10:** What is the anticipated budget for the requested services?

**A10:** The Joint CCAs will use the responses to their initial RFI and the responses to this solicitation to finalize an anticipated budget.

**Q11:** The second paragraph of the RFP states that one of the goals of the work is to “ensure that our respective individual IRPs integrate well with other load-serving entity IRPs”. Please clarify the scope of other load-serving entities with which the IRPs are expected to integrate. Does other load-serving entities refer to other CCAs, the IOUs (PG&E, SCE, SDG&E), the munis (SMUD, LADWP)?

**A11:** The statement refers to LSEs filing IRPs with the CPUC in the IRP proceeding.

**Q12:** Paragraph 3b states the consultant must “Model the aggregated portfolio performance using SERVM or other production cost software to establish cost performance, reliability, GHG emissions, and criteria pollutant emissions.” The Evaluation of Proposals section states: Released

“Experience using RESOLVE, SERVM, and PLEXOS models”. The implication is that PLEXOS is an acceptable alternative to SERVM. Please confirm.

**A12:** Please see A1.

**Q13:** The Evaluation of Proposals section states that the Joint CCAs may negotiate with several Consultants simultaneously and award contracts to several consultants. Please confirm that if there are changes to the scope of work for a Consultant, or the Consultant must share work and other information with another consultant, that the pricing submitted with the Consultant’s proposal may be revised by the Consultant as necessary.

**A13:** Confirmed.

**Q14:** Desired Project Timeline indicates that “True up with the CPUC 2019 reference system plan” should occur in December 2019. However, the Scope of Work section does not mention a true up task. Please advise during which task that the requested true up should occur.

**A14:** Task 3.

**Q15:** Does the Joint CCA want to optimize the deployment of EE/DG/EV/DER under the Alternative portfolio and will assumptions regarding the potential costs and potential penetration be provided for each CCA area, or is the consultant expected to build such alternative assumptions?

**A15:** The Joint CCAs would welcome information about opportunities to optimize deployment of EE/DG/EV/DER. If this effort would result in meaningful additional cost please list this cost separately. Different CCAs have different levels of information about potential cost and penetration of EE/DG/EV/DER in their areas.

**Q16:** Does the joint CCA expect Sensitivity analysis for both conforming and alternative portfolio?

**A16:** The joint CCAs expect the ability to undertake sensitivity analysis for both the conforming and alternate portfolios.

**Q17:** Please update to the RFP Timeline.

**A17:**

<b>Selection Timeline:</b>	
<i>Action</i>	<i>Date</i>
Issuance of RFP	July 29, 2019
Deadline to submit questions	August 5, 2019
Deadline to submit proposals	August 19, 2019
Proposal evaluation	August 20-23, 2019
Finalist selection/interviews if needed	August 26-28, 2019
Award of agreement	September 2, 2019

**Q18:** Item 3a of the RFP identifies the use of RESOLVE in considering forward-looking portfolios. Is the Joint CCA open to use of other capable tools for this portion of the analysis?

**A18:** The Joint CCAs are open to use of other capable tools provided that they conform to the requirements of the CPUC and allow the Joint CCAs to effectively prepare compliant IRPs, participate in the CPUC's IRP process, and have a solid understanding of what the CPUC's eventual evaluation of the portfolios will be.

**Q19:** In its evaluation of responses to the RFP, will the Joint CCA give a preference to proposals which rely on RESOLVE?

**A19:** Not necessarily. The preference is to utilize a model that most effectively accounts for future market inputs and variables and selects the least cost resources that address the joint CCA loads. As noted above, this process must also comply to the CPUC requirements and provide sound insights into what the CPUC's evaluation of the portfolios would be. If an alternative model is identified, please provide a comparison to assist in evaluating different models/tools.

**Q20:** If open to use of other tools, does the Joint CCA also prefer to perform a benchmarking analysis to RESOLVE as part of the modeling exercise?

**A20:** See above. If a different tool or model is utilized a benchmarking analysis would be valuable to quantify the difference between methodologies. This is likely something that the CPUC would want to see as well.

**Q20:** Does the Joint CCA have any preference to the type of models (e.g. stochastic, probabilistic, deterministic, combination) it would like to utilize for the IRP analysis of the aggregated portfolio performance?

**A20:** The Joint CCAs will review and assess the proposed modeling as part of their evaluation of the proposals. Please provide your recommendation of a type(s) of model and identify pros and cons to that selection relative to other options, especially in light of the CPUC's likely approach to evaluating portfolios.