



**RFP No. PSC-20-23**  
**Addendum No. 1**  
**Issued: October 16, 2020**

**A. Questions and Answers**

Please find below questions and answers pertaining to RFP No. PSC-20-23.

**Question 1**

- a. Will the Commission allow or consider a waiver of the requirement for 35% Small and Local contractor?
- b. Can an Offeror request a waiver of this requirement if they show good faith efforts to find a suitable candidate and are not successful?

**Answer to Questions 1a and 1b**

**The Commission will not consider a waiver of the requirement for economic inclusion described in Section C.2 of the RFP.**

**Question 2**

We understand that if the offeror does not qualify as a CBE, then there is a requirement for 35% of work to be done by a subcontractor that does qualify.

- a. How is 35% defined? Is it by hours? Fees? Or some other metric?

**Answer to Question 2a.**

**35% is defined by the dollar value of the contract.**

- b. Is there a possibility for additional points if the offeror is not a CBE but the offeror selects a subcontractor that meets *multiple* of the criteria for bonus points laid out in Section C.1?

**Answer to Question 2b.**

**No. Preference points are only awarded to CBE prime contractors, including certified joint ventures.**

**Question 3**

Given COVID are still you demonstrating a preference for locality with a DC presence?

### Answer to Question 3

“Preference” refers to the additional points a CBE prime is entitled to as delineated in Section C.1 of the RFP. A non-certified offeror is required to subcontract 35% of the work to a CBE.

### Question 4

For Section C, given the nature of the work does the emphasis remain on the desire to include a DC Business Enterprise and score their participation accordingly? The nature of the work is very focused and specific. Partnering may add unnecessary cost or operational complexities to get the job done. We are wondering if Section C is applicable for this RFP?

### Answer to Question 4

Section C is applicable to this RFP.

### Question 5

- a. Is it acceptable to submit an offer with an application for certification as a CBE in progress, given the coronavirus-related service modifications of the DSLBD?
- b. Will points be awarded to a bidder if the bidder is in the process of receiving these certifications but has not yet received certification from the DSLBD?
- c. For the SLDDBE participation requirement, if we partner with a firm in the process of being qualified as a disadvantaged business and note it in our Attachment F, can our proposal still be eligible?

### Answer to Question 5a, 5b, and 5c

In accordance with Section C, a copy of the certification acknowledgement letter must be submitted with the Offeror’s submission whether applicable to the prime contractor or the subcontractor(s). If a certification letter is not submitted with the proposal for a prime contractor seeking preference points, points will not be given. A non-certified prime contractor is required to subcontract 35% of the work to CBEs.

**Rather than delay the proposal evaluation process due to pending certifications, the Commission will consider requests from potential offerors to extend the proposal submission date to complete the DSLBD certification process. Requests to extend the proposal submission date must be submitted to Karen Hester at [khester@psc.dc.gov](mailto:khester@psc.dc.gov) no later than October 23, 2020.**

### Question 6

Is a Certified Business Enterprise (CBE), with one or more certifications as defined in Section C.1., required to be included in the proposal?

### Answer to Question 6

A CBE, with one or more certifications as defined in Section C.1., is required to be included in the proposal as a subcontractor unless the Offeror itself is a CBE.

### Question 7

Is it a requirement that either: a) the prime contractor is a certified business enterprise (CBE), or b) that a portion of the work be performed by a CBE?

Answer to Question 7

Yes. Section C.2 requires that a non-certified Offeror subcontract 35% of the work to a CBE.

Question 8

Was a consultant involved in the development of the RFP, and will this consultant be allowed to compete in the solicitation?

Answer to Question 8

A consultant was not involved in the development of the RFP.

Question 9

Will the RFP response be acceptable through email delivery only?

Answer to Question 9

Yes. In accordance with Section E.1 and E.2 proposals shall be emailed to Karen Hester at [khester@psc.dc.gov](mailto:khester@psc.dc.gov) no later than 4:00 PM on November 2, 2020.

Question 10

Would you clarify the meaning of “The pages of the proposal must be numbered with index tabs included for each section.”? We assume an electronic submission is all that is required.

Answer to Question 10

Section E.3.1, Delete: ““The pages of the proposal must be numbered with index tabs included for each section.” and Replace with:

“The pages of the proposal must be numbered with a clear correlation to the Table of Contents.”

Question 11

You identified 4 states that have or are working through VDER (NH, NY, CA, and HI). Is your preference weighted toward those consultants who may have worked within one or more of those studies?

Answer to Question 11

The Commission’s preference is not weighted toward consultants who may have worked within one or more of the NH, NY, CA and HI studies.

Question 12

We understand the contract term is one year, but that the PSC can extend the contract term at its sole discretion. Would the winning offeror be required to maintain the same fixed fee in the case the PSC extends the contract term? Alternatively, is there a process to increase fees if the contract term is extended?

Answer to Question 12

Offerors may propose a rate increase for the option year. A revised Attachment A is attached to and incorporated into this Addendum.

### Question 13

The current RFP relates to Phase I. Would Phase II be put out for separate bid? Also, please confirm that the fixed fee pricing proposal is only for Phase I.

#### Answer to Question 13

- a. Yes, Phase II of the VDER Study will require a separate request for proposals.
- b. Yes, the fixed fee is only for Phase I of the VDER Study.

### Question 14

What level of support would (or would not) the Commission provide for information/data gathering? It is somewhat unclear to us the Commission's role would be, e.g., with respect to the language of RFP Section B.4 which says, "To achieve these purposes and to identify a sample set of feeders, information-gathering and data requests will be required from Pepco and Washington Gas."

#### Answer to Question 14

The Commission will serve only as a liaison between the Contractor and the utilities to make introductions and keep the utilities informed of any obligations to provide data. The Contractor is responsible for determining data needs and conveying those to the Commission and utilities. Contractor will draft data requests and Staff will submit them to the utilities.

### Question 15

The identification and characterization of feeder types archetypes will require close collaboration with PEPCO distribution planning staff. Additionally, given that the locational analysis tool developed by Pepco will not be available until mid-2021 and that the analytical methods and tools developed and utilized by the Offeror should preferably be compatible with PEPCO's distribution planning tools and procedures, will the Commission ask PEPCO and Washington Gas to facilitate access to data and to their staffs, and to collaborate with the consultant from the beginning of the Study?

#### Answer to Question 15

Yes.

### Question 16

Does the PSC want a value of DER for each feeder type (e.g. 6-12 feeders) for each of the individual DERS listed (i.e., a-i on page 4 of RFP) or to determine the optimal mix of DERS on each feeder type, based on hosting capacity constraints, and then determine the associated value of that optimal mix of DERS?

#### Answer to Question 16

Section A.1 on p.4 of the VDER RFP is not an exhaustive list and the Contractor is expected to assess the best course of action.

### Question 17

The RFP points out the interrelation of this Study to the on the Value of Solar and the Future of Solar Studies sponsored by the Office of People's Counsel (OPC). To what extent is this study thought to be a follow up to the recommendations made in those two studies, and to what extent does the PSC intend to collaborate with the OPC beyond the OPC's participation in the CEAI Working Group?

Answer to Question 17

The report and findings of the OPC Value of Solar Study should be reviewed and considered by the Contractor; however, the Value of DER Study is expected to be completed independently and without direct collaboration with OPC.

Question 18

Will the PSC anticipate and/or welcome the involvement of a National Laboratory in the preparation of this Study?

Answer to Question 18

All qualified offerors are encouraged to submit bids pursuant to the instructions outlined in the RFP.

Question 19

Has the PSC already begun any efforts to develop a value stack calculation methodology or is this its first attempt?

Answer to Question 19

No, the Commission has not. The Consultant is allowed to use a different approach if he or she prefers, or to present preferred approach along with the value stack approach.

Question 20

What guidance or rules has the PSC already established with respect to assessing DER cost-effectiveness (e.g., energy efficiency cost-effectiveness tests, demand response cost-effectiveness, etc.)? For example, as the PSC established the discount rate that should be used or any other parameters to be used for cost-effectiveness analyses?

Answer to Question 20

The contractor will analyze the significance of the BCA discount rate, appropriate considerations for choosing a BCA discount rate, and make recommendations regarding the appropriate discount rate for the BCA.

Question 21

What data will be available for each of the feeders analyzed? Specifically, what data will be available regarding historical peak loads (e.g., only the peak load date and hour, or 8760 hourly data), load growth, customer types served by the feeder (commercial vs. residential), and DER hosting capacity constraints?

Answer to Question 21

Commission staff will facilitate coordination with the Contractor and the utilities.

Question 22

How does the PSC expect Pepco's Benefit-Cost Analysis handbook (expected to be submitted in October 2020) to interface with the framework for valuing DERs?

Answer to Question 22

The Commission cannot anticipate exactly how Pepco's Benefit-Cost Analysis (BCA) handbook will interface with the VDER Study. However, as mentioned in the VDER RFP, the Commission does expect Pepco's BCA Handbook to serve as a resource to the consultant.

Question 23

Will the Consultant have access to Pepco's locational analysis tool once it is complete in early 2021? If so, will this access include the ability to run the tool for specific feeders?

Answer to Question 23

Yes.

Question 24

Please provide any Marginal Cost of Service studies provided to the District of Columbia's Utility Commission over the past 5 years.

Answer to Question 24

A marginal cost of service study is not a requirement for Pepco to provide in distribution rate cases in the District of Columbia. The Commission does not have a Marginal Cost of Service study to provide to the Consultant.

Question 25

Please provide any System Loss studies provided to the District of Columbia's Utility Commission over the past 5 years.

Answer to Question 25

System loss studies are not required from the electric company in the District of Columbia. The Commission does not have a System Loss study to provide to the Consultant.

Question 26

Please confirm that the dynamic pricing formula discussed in section B.1 is the same as deliverable "c" in section B.9

Answer to Question 26

In Sections B.1 and B.9, the phrase "dynamic pricing" means only that temporal and locational factors will be involved in the valuation.

Question 27

Is there a particular or preferred budget that you can share?

Answer to Question 27

There isn't a predetermined budget for the VDER Study.

Question 28

Section B.6.b. refers to "best return on investment." Whose investment does this refer to?

Answer to Question 28

In this context “best return on investment” means cost-effective use of resources and does not refer to the profits of any entity.

Question 29

The RFP mentions Attachments A, B, C, D, and F. Please point us to Attachment F (SBE Subcontracting) – we do not see it included with the other attachments in the solicitation announcement. Also, please confirm there is no Attachment E.

Answer to Question 29

Attachment F has been changed to Attachment E. Attachment E is attached to and incorporated into this Addendum.

Question 30

Do you have expectations for an amount of time the consultant should spend working onsite vs. remote work?

Answer to Question 30

The Contractor is not expected to spend any specific amount of time working on-site.

**B. Additional RFP Modifications**

1. Add the following to Section D.4.1, 3) Scoring Criteria:

“The Offerors shall submit with its proposal, a minimum of two completed Past Performance Evaluation Forms (Attachment D) for work performed that is similar to the work required by this RFP.”

2. For the purpose of promoting partnership opportunities, the Commission has attached to this Addendum its RFP distribution list with an indication of firms that are CBEs.

**C. Attachments**

1. Revised Attachment A Offer Letter/Bid Form
2. Attachment E, SBE Subcontracting Form
3. RFP Distribution List

**-End of Addendum-**