

RFP NO. PSC-18-08
TECHNICAL CONSULTANT TO ADVISE THE COMMISSION ON FC 1130 – MODERNIZING THE ENERGY DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM FOR INCREASED SUSTAINABILITY (MEDSIS)

ADDENDUM NO. 3
ISSUED: March 28, 2018

This Addendum No. 3 to RFP No. PSC-18-08 is issued by e-mail and posted on the Commission's website at www.dcpsc.org.

Section 1 - Questions and Responses

Below are questions and answers regarding the subject RFP.

1. RFP Section 12 outlines proposal requirements and submission guidelines. Is there a page limit for proposal sections (e.g. Technical Proposal, Technical Approach & Work Plan) and/or for the overall proposal submission?

Response: No. There is no page limit, although Offerors are encouraged to be clear and succinct.

2. We have started working on our RFP response in a PowerPoint document. Is it acceptable to mail printed slides on 8 ½" x 11" paper for our proposal submission?

Response: Offerors shall submit hard copies of proposal documents that represent its best response to the RFP requirements.

3. We will ask our previous project clients to fill out Attachment E- Past Performance Evaluation Form. Is it possible to get a Word/PDF editable form that we can send to our clients?

Response: Yes. See attached.

4. Please define in more detail what is meant by a "system assessment" and what some of the factors the Commission envisions should be considered in determining whether one is necessary or not?

Response: A "System Assessment" refers to an assessment of the current state of the energy delivery and distribution system within a given jurisdiction, with respect to the objectives of the MEDSIS initiative, including reliability, resiliency, interactivity, sustainability, and the ability to effectively integrate distributed energy resources (DER).

Such an assessment would identify the strengths of a given energy delivery system, as well as the opportunities for improvement, regarding each MEDSIS objective.

The assessment process involves gathering data and facts about demand and supply-side programs. This includes, but will not be limited to, demand-side programs such as energy efficiency, demand response, or other DSM programs. Supply-side factors include assessment of planned infrastructure and distribution capacity additions, reliability, load growth and customer-driven projects, expected capital investment projects, the current and anticipated DER deployment (including possible microgrid or energy storage efforts), and small generator interconnection efforts, including projected solar and other renewable energy initiatives underway in the jurisdiction. Pepco's current undergrounding power lines initiative (Formal Case No. 1145-DC Plug), Pepco's proposed Capital Grid Project (Formal Case No. 1144), and emerging proposed Electric Vehicle (EV) efforts should also be considered. The assessment would also consider energy load forecasting issues, including actual and forecasted load for the system, DER hosting capacity, and locational analysis identifying hot spots (or capacity-constrained areas in the distribution system) within the District.

A final product of such an assessment would be the identification of target opportunities, where DER could be effectively deployed in a cost-effective, reliable, and safe manner-- by specific location and technology. The identification of target opportunities would facilitate a more strategic and effective implementation of the MEDSIS pilot project program.

5. Regarding the language at p. 5 subparagraph i of the RFP No. PSC 18-08 (RFP), regarding the scope of Phase 1 of the subject MEDSIS process, does the RFP contemplate that in Phase 1 of that MEDSIS process, the Consultant not only will manage the process by which an evaluation is made whether a District of Columbia-energy-distribution-system assessment is necessary, but also that an affirmative finding presumably by the District of Columbia Public Service Commission (Commission) will require the Consultant to thereafter actually conduct that assessment and report the conclusions to the Commission? If so, does this mean that bidders on the RFP must factor into their bids not only time and resources for managing the process of evaluating whether an assessment is needed, but time and resources for actually conducting a potential assessment as well once the Commission has made its finding?

Response: Yes. On Attachment B, Bid Form (Form of Offer Letter), Offerors will provide an estimated price for Phase 1 with the Technical Assessment and without the Technical Assessment.

6. Regarding potential working groups, please explain the distinction that the Commission is envisioning between #2) Distributed Energy Resources (DER) and #3) EVs, Energy Storage, and Solar PV—since storage and solar (and arguably EVs) are all different types of DERs?

Response: EV, Energy Storage, and Solar PV are types of DERs. Issues related to each may be addressed in a single DER Working Group or it may be appropriate to establish individual working groups to address the specific DER categories. That should be determined by the consultant in conjunction with stakeholders.

7. Since the actual number and type of working groups for Phase 2 won't be determined until after Phase 1, and the number of working groups would likely greatly impact the overall budget—for purposes of budgeting should we assume a range or illustrative number of working groups for Phase 2?

Response: Offerors can assume that six (6) working groups are formed. However, in accordance with revised Section 12.7 of the RFP, the Offeror shall fully describe what assumptions, if any, were made in developing its resource schedule.

8. Is it envisioned that the Working Groups will be conducted over approximately 10 months (starting approximately 2 months after contract commencement and ending 1 year after contract); or approximately 14 months (starting 2 months after contract and then quarterly for a year thereafter)?

Response: It is envisioned that the entire working group process will be completed within 1 year, unless a system assessment or an extension of the term is required.

9. Could you provide a list of RFP recipients to facilitate potential teaming?

Response: Yes. This information will be forwarded under separate cover by the end of the week.

10. Given that it's not clear whether a "system assessment" is necessary or the precise sub-topics for work groups—and hence all the expertise needed for the "technical consulting" (as opposed to the skilled facilitation)—is it acceptable to have a placeholder budget for some of the technical work and ability to add technical consultants to the team as needed (and with Commission approval)?

Response: See response to Question 5.

11. Given that the question and answer period was extended, will the RFP deadline also be extended (to allow more time to digest the Commission's responses, for teaming, etc.)? And if so until when?

Response: See below, Section 2 – RFP Modifications

Section 2 – RFP Modifications

1. The proposal submission date and time is hereby extended to **no later than 4:00 PM EDT on April 17, 2018.**
2. Add the following to Section 12.7 Price Proposal:

For Attachment B, Phase 2: Working Group Process, it is requested that Offerors use six (6) working groups as a baseline and explain any other assumptions that were made in estimating the labor categories and number of hours.