



**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS NO. PSC-20-23**

**Value of Distributed Energy Resources Study**

Proposal Issue Date: September 30, 2020

Proposal Due Date: November 2, 2020  
No later than 4:00 PM EST

Submit Electronically To: Karen M. Hester  
Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia  
Email: [khester@psc.dc.gov](mailto:khester@psc.dc.gov)

Contact: Karen M. Hester  
Contract Specialist  
Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia  
1325 G Street, N.W., 8th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: 202-626-5128  
Email: [khester@psc.dc.gov](mailto:khester@psc.dc.gov)

## **SECTION A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **A.1. Purpose**

The Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia (“Commission”) seeks a Consultant to provide consulting services on a Value of Distributed Energy Resources (“DER”) Study. This RFP will cover Phase I of the study, which involves (1) the creation of a valuation methodology applicable to multiple forms of DER) and which vary by location and time; and(2) a Roadmap for the implementation of value of DER policies in the District.

### **A.2. Contract Term**

It is anticipated that the contract term will be one year with the possibility to extend at the Commission’s sole discretion.

### **A.3. Type of Contract**

The contract resulting from this RFP will be fixed price. The price for Phase I will be established upon contract award.

### **A.4. Selection Criteria**

Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with **Section D** of this RFP. The following evaluation criteria will be used:

- Qualifications and Technical Expertise (25 points)
- Clarity of Proposed Approach (25 points)
- General Experience (15 points)
- Cost of Services and Expenses (15 points)
- Ability to Work in DC (10 points)
- Overall Responsiveness of Proposal (10 points)

### **A.5. Anticipated Procurement Schedule**

Publish RFP on Commission website	September 30, 2020
Deadline for RFP questions	October 9, 2020
Responses to questions posted on the Commission’s website	October 16, 2020
Deadline for submission of proposals	November 2, 2020
Establish Competitive Range	November 15, 2020
Best and Final Offers submitted	December 1, 2020
Contract Executed	December 15, 2020

**A.6. List of Attachments**

Attachment A - Offer Letter/Bid Form

Attachment B - Disclosure Statement

Attachment C - Tax Certification Affidavit

Attachment D - Past Performance Evaluation Form

## **SECTION B. SCOPE OF WORK**

### **B.1. Background**

The Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia (“Commission”) was originally established by Congress in 1913 and was reaffirmed by Congress as an independent agency of the District of Columbia Government in the District of Columbia Home Rule Charter in 1973. The Commission functions as an independent, quasi-judicial agency in the District of Columbia Government. Our mission is to serve the public interest by ensuring that financially healthy utility companies provide safe, reliable and quality utility services at reasonable rates for District of Columbia customers, while fostering grid modernization, conservation of natural resources, preservation of environmental quality, and advancement of the District’s climate policy commitments.

The Power Path DC Pilot Projects Governance Board (“Governance Board”) has been established to assist the Commission in executing the Power Path DC vision statement. To do so, the Governance Board will provide support in selecting and contracting pilot projects, which aid in the development of a modern energy delivery system that is sustainable, well-planned, encourages distributed energy resources (in particular, renewable energy resources), and preserves the financial health of the energy distribution utilities in a manner that results in an energy delivery system that is safe and reliable, secure, affordable, interactive, and nondiscriminatory. According to the CleanEnergy DC Omnibus Amendment Act of 2018 (“CEDC Act”), GHG emission reduction needs to achieve 50% by 2032, and 100% by 2050. Furthermore, the Tier One Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard should achieve 100% in 2032. Thus, any pilot project selections should be consistent with the Commission’s statutory mandate to preserve environmental quality, including the effects on global climate change and the District’s public climate commitments.

Distributed energy resources (“DER”) are resources sited close to the customer’s load that can provide all or some of the customer’s energy needs, can also be used by the system to either reduce demand (such as demand response) or increase supply to satisfy the energy, capacity, and/or ancillary service needs of the distribution or transmission system. DERs are able to provide a range of services. These include providing clean energy from renewable sources to customers, tools to manage peaks in demand, and ancillary services such as voltage regulation, or potentially reduce PJM congestion pricing. However, without a framework for assigning values to these services, the Commission cannot move forward to promulgate innovative rates and tariffs that will compensate DER customers and investors for providing these services. Without a Value of DER framework, progress on modernizing the energy delivery system to account for the two-way flow of energy, data, and ancillary services will be blocked.

Based on the Modernizing the Energy Delivery System for Increased Sustainability (MEDSIS)<sup>1</sup> Rate Design Working Group’s recommendation and the recent Governance Board selection in GD-2020-02-M, the Commission plans to hire an outside consultant to produce a methodology and metrics for determining the Value of DERs (including locational and temporal differences).

---

<sup>1</sup> The initial D.C. grid modernization proceeding was established under the name of MEDSIS, which represents Modernizing the Energy Delivery System for Increased Sustainability.

This initial Phase I of analysis will result in a “Roadmap” and dynamic pricing formula which would then be implemented during Phase II.

If the Value of DER study is done on a feeder-by-feeder basis, it would be very costly and may not be necessary in this initial phase of Valuation of DER. Thus, this Phase I study should, as a proxy for a feeder-by-feeder analysis, sample several feeder types (e.g., ranging from 6 to 12 feeders based on technical appropriateness) based on the time of peak (i.e., morning, afternoon, evening or more granular regarding peak and off-peak hours), whether they are commercial or residential or a combination, and cover the District’s different grid architectures (i.e., spot and area network, radial feeders, underground or overhead). Consultant could be tasked with developing the relevant categories of feeder types in consultation with the Commission.

Tariffs and rates in the District of Columbia do not account for changes in the Value of DERs by location and over time (e.g., Net Energy Metering rates). The goal of the study would be to identify a framework to translate multiple, time-and-location-specific inputs into a Value of DER framework for the District using the selected feeder types. This value should aim to reflect DERs’ full value to society based on a holistic set of costs and benefits, in addition to the perspectives of utilities and ratepayers and this value framework can then be used to calculate rates of DER compensation.

Improved distribution system planning that takes better account of DER is both possible and necessary in the District of Columbia. The existing Net Energy Metering (“NEM”) tariff is sub-optimal that does not reflect fully and accurately the potential value of DERs to the distribution system. Meanwhile, there is growing interest among customers and DER developers; as DER activity intensifies, the Commission needs to ensure that the benefits of DER are maximized while also ensuring that any costs of DER deployment are fairly allocated among developers, customer classes, and the regulated utility. The Commission seeks a new framework that will accurately and fairly compensate DER resources.

The list of DERs to be evaluated should include, but not be limited to, the following:

- a. Solar PV
- b. Energy storage
- c. Solar and storage
- d. Energy Efficiency
- e. Demand Response
- f. Advanced inverter system capabilities
- g. Microgrids (and microgrid controller capabilities)
- h. Electric Vehicles (including V2G)
- i. Combined Heat and Power (CHP)

## **B.2. General Issues Assessed**

Multiple categories of DER values should be assessed, including: consumers (including the host customer), societal, environmental<sup>2</sup>, distribution system, transmission system, energy, capacity, hosting capacity expansion, reliability, resiliency, ancillary service markets (i.e., voltage and frequency support, etc.), and avoided distribution system upgrades.<sup>3</sup>

DER values can take different forms: (1) vary by DER type, (2) vary dynamically by location and time, or (3) determined project by project. Overall methodology is to identify where and when DERs can be compensated for benefits and be provided in ways that are efficient, accurate and fair. The overall goal of the VDER study and Phase II implementation is to dynamically involve all different DERs at various locations at different points of time to reach grid optimization in a least cost and reliable fashion.

Furthermore, within reason, the differential and equitable impact on residents of DC should be examined, for example, if a specific DER or electric vehicles would make a significant impact on air quality and health in underserved part of the District, those types of factors should be taken into account and highlighted by the report.

## **B.3. Best Practices of Other Jurisdictions**

One key question of this initial phase is: “How have other jurisdictions approached these Value of DER issues and what challenges have they encountered?” We note that states like New York and New Hampshire have specific Value of DER proceedings. The Consultant should identify “best practices” for designing methodologies to assess and compare the value of various state alternatives, including:

- a. California
- b. New York<sup>4</sup> (including the concept of identifying Opportunity Zones<sup>5</sup>)
- c. New Hampshire<sup>6</sup> and
- d. Hawaii

---

<sup>2</sup> The social and environmental values should consult the Commission working group that is developing a cost-benefit framework for the District that values social and environmental costs and benefits -- GD-2019-04-M Working Group.

<sup>3</sup> “Value” does not refer only to monetary savings and costs. Value may encompass multiple elements and associated physical measures such as reliability, resiliency, flexibility, sustainability, security, environmental quality, public health and safety, and economic impact.

<sup>4</sup> New York Case 15-E-0751: Value of Distributed Energy Resources (“VDER”).

<sup>5</sup> Opportunity Zones are areas in which locational benefits of distributed generation are maximized and must make up at least 40 percent of the utility’s service territory. (See OPC’s Value of Solar Study at page 51.)

<sup>6</sup> The VDER study in New York and New Hampshire employed a value stack approach to evaluate the net costs and benefits. 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.

#### **B.4. Identifying Components and Metrics to Determine the Value of DER**

Simulation and scenario analysis should be used to demonstrate the impact of a specific DER for a specific feeder type, to dynamically demonstrate grid optimization through various DER categories at various locations during different time periods. Examples using existing DERs or potential DERs in the District of Columbia would be extremely useful for distribution planning purposes.

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. To provide the Value of DER, PJM wholesale markets zonal and nodal Locational Marginal Pricing (“LMP”) prices may be needed as well. The VDER study will calculate various categories of long-term avoided costs. Historical data needs to be reviewed to verify and validate any forward projections. Net avoided costs will be presented on a net present value basis using appropriate discount rates to be developed by the Consultant.

#### **B.5. Interrelationship with Related Efforts in the District of Columbia**

The Office of the People’s Counsel of the District of Columbia (“OPC”) has sponsored a Value of Solar Study, which provided an overview of the solar framework in D.C. In its Non-Wires Alternative/Distribution System Planning process, the Potomac Electric Power Company (“Pepco”) is developing a locational analysis tool but this analysis will be specific to avoided distribution system upgrades only and does not include the full value stack of DER services. Furthermore, this tool will not be available until early 2021.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, Pepco will submit a Benefit-Cost Analysis (“BCA”) handbook in October which will be shared with the consultant. The Commission currently has a *GD-2019-04-M Clean Energy Act Implementation (“CEAI”) Working Group*. The Working Group will discuss three major subjects regarding climate mitigation – (1) Subject #1 – Underlying Measurements/Metrics (2) Subject #2 – Selection of the Benefit-Cost Analysis Framework and (3) Subject #3 – Utility Reporting Requirements. See Commission website for more information. Staff will coordinate the required feedback from the CEAI Working Group, if necessary. Furthermore, CEDC has authorized Pepco and Washington Gas Light Company to sponsor Energy Efficiency and Demand Response<sup>8</sup> programs and *Formal Case No. 1160 Working Group report* (issued January 2020) is also relevant in terms of understanding the benefit-cost analysis for such programs.

---

<sup>7</sup> Pepco has been working with PowerPathDC stakeholders to implement Pepco’s Distribution System Planning for Non-Wires Alternatives (“DSP/NWA”) Process approved in Order No. 20286. On October 1, 2020, the Company will hold its third workshop for stakeholders under the DSP/NWA Process: Utility & Stakeholder Locational Constraints Report Preparation. Pepco has released a Locational Constraints Report will be the subject of an RFP to be issued on November 1, 2020, with responses due by February 1, 2021.

<sup>8</sup> In the District of Columbia, we have a utility sponsored residential Direct Load Control Program – a AC cycling program with roughly 30,000 participants with peak demand reduction of roughly 20 MWs. In addition, we also have commercial demand response provided by Curtailable Service Providers which reduces peak demand by roughly 78 MWs. However, like many other states, such programs have not targeted on “load constrained” areas where the value of DER could be higher.

## **B.6. Roadmap for DER Valuation in the District of Columbia**

In the recommended Roadmap, the Consultant should identify the sequence of developing new market/pricing signals for each of the listed DERs based on the identified feeder types. The Consultant may want to consider a phased strategy:

- a. Phase I focuses on developing full dynamic pricing/valuation of DER including time and locational differences.
- b. The Consultant should indicate what strategy will achieve the best return on investment. For example, (1) should a NEM approach be focused first, (2) should Demand Response assessment in the District of Columbia be assessed first or (3) should both be done in parallel for Phase II. Other DERs should be looked into as well. The sequence of follow-up actions with regard to implementing value of DERs should be explained in the final report.
- c. In Phase II, the Consultant can develop tariffs (including locational and temporal impact) for services beyond current retail rates such as generation rates or full retail rates (which are used under the existing NEM tariff).<sup>9</sup>

The Consultant is encouraged to go beyond the first two items (a and b) by providing some examples for Phase II work in order to demonstrate the applicability of the Phase I framework.

The Consultant should have relevant technical distribution system modeling and operational/planning capabilities and be familiar with Value of DER studies, in general, and Experience with specific state and/or any other research on Value of DER would be preferred. The consultant could incorporate various modeling and scenario analyses in this study.

## **B.7. Presentation and Timeline**

The initial draft report is expected eight months after the consultant's kick-off meeting. The consultant should present its findings to the Commission, Governance Board, and other stakeholders, as assigned. The final deliverable will be due within one year, as a Phase I product.

This report will present a starting point from which to develop pricing signals to encourage DER integration in a beneficial manner. This framework will be developed for the transition to a more dynamic rate design/rates and tariffs and an integrated distribution planning process.

After discussion with the Commission and Governance Board, a Phase II study scope of work will be structured. The purpose of Phase II is to implement the Phase I Roadmap and to develop recommendations for rates and tariffs for specific DERs, in close collaboration with the *Formal Case No.1130 Rate Design Working Group*. The current RFP includes tasks for Phase I only.

---

<sup>9</sup> For instance, that NEM often *undercompensates* DERs for avoiding emissions of greenhouse gases and local pollutants. And, in general, NEM does not offer an accurate price signal to guide developers and would-be DER owners to put the right sort of DER in the right place, resulting in economically inefficient patterns of development.



## **B.8. Recommended References**

The Commission recommends that the Consultant review the literature below in development of the report:

- a. National Standard Practice Manual for Benefit-Cost Analysis of DER (August 2020), NESP. <https://www.nationalenergyscreeningproject.org/national-standard-practice-manual/>
- b. PNNL, Distributed Generation Valuation and Compensation, [https://www.pnnl.gov/main/publications/external/technical\\_reports/PNNL-27271.pdf](https://www.pnnl.gov/main/publications/external/technical_reports/PNNL-27271.pdf)
- c. CPUC Locational Net Benefit Analysis Working Group Final Report <https://gridworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Locational-Net-Benefit-Analysis-Working-Group-Final-Report.pdf>
- d. NYPSC CASE 15-E-0751, *Order Regarding Value Stack Compensation*
- e. FC1160, Working Group Report, January 30, 2020 at [www.dcpsc.org](http://www.dcpsc.org)
- f. GD-2019-04-M at [www.dcpsc.org](http://www.dcpsc.org)
- g. OPC Sponsored Value of Solar Study:
  - I. “Future of Solar PV in the District of Columbia”, by Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. May 28, 2020.
  - II. “Distributed Solar in District of Columbia”, by Synapse, April 12, 2017.
- h. Commission RPS Council Report, May 1, 2020 at [www.dcpsc.org](http://www.dcpsc.org).

## **B.9. Deliverables**

The Consultant will provide to the Commission the following five (5) deliverables.

- a. Value of DER Survey: Survey of “best practices” in other jurisdictions regarding approaches to the valuation of DERs to identify key elements that will help achieve the objective of the study called for under this RFP.
- b. Feeder Analysis: Analysis of a sample of different feeder archetypes to demonstrate how relevant DER types can provide distribution system services at various times and locations in the District of Columbia.
- c. Methodological Framework: Using the inputs from the feeder study, provide an overall methodology to identify ways in which DERs can be compensated efficiently, fairly, and accurately for benefits which vary by time and location.
- d. Related Efforts Analysis: As a foundation for the Roadmap, this analysis will evaluate all DER-related activities in the District of Columbia and highlight their inter-relations.

- e. Recommended Roadmap: Recommend a sequence of steps to develop new market/pricing signals for each of the DERs identified in the Feeder Analysis as well as recommended priorities for future Commission actions.

## **SECTION C. ECONOMIC INCLUSION**

### **C.1. Preference for Local and Disadvantaged Business Enterprises or Businesses Operating in an Enterprise Zone**

Under the provisions of the Small, Local and Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Development and Assistance Amendment Act of 2005<sup>10</sup>, preference shall be given to Offerors that are certified by the Department of Small and Local Business Development (“DSLBD”) as having resident business ownership, being a Local Business Enterprise, being a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise, or as operating in an Enterprise Zone. (A copy of the certification acknowledgment letter must be submitted with the Offeror’s submission and, if applicable, the Technical Proposal.) In accordance with these laws, the following preferences shall be awarded in evaluating an Offeror’s proposal:

- Three points shall be awarded if the Offeror is certified as a small business enterprise;
- Five points shall be awarded if the Offeror is certified as resident-owned business;
- Ten points shall be awarded if the Offeror is certified as a longtime resident business;
- Two points shall be awarded if the Offeror is certified as a local business enterprise;
- Two points shall be awarded if the Offeror is certified as a local business enterprise with its principal office located in an enterprise zone; and
- Two points shall be awarded if the Offeror is certified as a disadvantaged business enterprise.

A Certified Business Enterprise (“CBE”) shall be entitled to any or all of the preferences provided in this section, but in no case shall a CBE be entitled to a preference of more than 12 points or a reduction in price of more than 12 percent.

---

<sup>10</sup> D.C. Code §2-218.01 et. seq. (2006 Repl. & Supp. 2008).

## **C.2 SLDBE Participation**

The Commission requires that significant participation by business enterprises certified by the Department of Small and Local Business Development as: (i) a local business enterprise; (ii) a small business enterprise; (iii) a disadvantaged business enterprise; (iv) having an owned resident business; (v) being a longtime business resident; or (vi) having a local business enterprise with its principal office located in an enterprise zone.

**Accordingly, and in addition to the preference points conferred by Section C.1 to certified prime contractors, the Commission requires that business enterprises so certified must participate in at least 35% of work unless the prime contractor is certified as a small, local or disadvantaged business enterprise.**

Offerors will be required to submit a SBE Subcontracting (Attachment F) with their proposals. The SBE Subcontracting Plan must demonstrate how this requirement will be met and, to the extent possible at this stage in the project, should identify the specific firms that will be used and their respective roles.

**Failure to adhere to this requirement will result in rejection of an Offeror's proposal.**

## **C.3 Information**

For information regarding the application process or for assistance in identifying certified businesses to meet the requirements of Section C.2, contact the DSLBD Business Opportunities Manager or Certification Manager at the following address or telephone number:

Department of Small and Local Business Development  
Government of the District of Columbia  
One Judiciary Square  
441 - 4th Street, N.W., 9<sup>th</sup> Floor, Suite 970 N  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 727-3900 (Telephone Number)  
(202) 724-3786 (Facsimile Number)

## **SECTION D. EVALUATION AWARD CRITERIA**

### **D.1. Evaluation Process**

The Commission will award the contract to the Offeror whose proposal, in light of all factors, is most advantageous to the Commission. Each Offeror will be evaluated in accordance with the Evaluation Criteria listed below, the procedures set forth in this RFP and the Commission's procurement regulations.

### **D.2. Evaluation Committee**

Each proposal shall be evaluated by an Evaluation Committee in accordance with the Evaluation Criteria. The Evaluation Committee shall prepare a written report summarizing its findings and submit the same to the selection official(s). The selection official will consider the report prepared by the Evaluation Committee, in making an award decision.

### **D.3. Oral Presentation**

The Commission reserves the right to interview Offerors in the competitive range if necessary. If the Commission conducts such interviews, each Offeror within the competitive range shall make an oral presentation to the Commission's Evaluation Committee and participate in a question and answer session. The purpose of the oral presentation and the question and answer session is to permit the Evaluation Committee to fully understand and assess the qualifications of each Offeror and the Offeror's key personnel.

#### **D.3.1. Schedule**

The order of presentation will be selected randomly, and the Offerors will be informed of their presentation date before the beginning of oral presentations. The Commission reserves the right to reschedule the date and time of any Offeror's presentation.

#### **D.3.2. Offeror Attendees**

The oral presentation will be made by the Offeror's personnel who will be assigned the key jobs for this project. Each Offeror will be limited to 4 persons. The job functions of the persons attending the presentation will be considered to be an indication of the Offeror's assessment of the key areas of responsibility that are deemed essential to the successful completion of the project.

#### **D.3.3. Topics**

The Offeror may present information about its capabilities and special qualifications, including the qualifications of key personnel

### **D.4. Proposal Evaluation**

Proposals will be reviewed and evaluated in a three-tier review process, followed by a contracting phase. The four steps are summarized below:

**Step 1:** Commission Staff shall assess completeness and responsiveness of proposals to eliminate non-conforming proposals. Staff may waive or offer a limited opportunity to cure

immaterial deviations from RFP requirements if it is determined to be in the best interests of the District.

**Step 2:** An Evaluation Team consisting of Staff members shall initially score conforming proposals and conduct interviews, if requested, as described below. The Evaluation Team shall score all proposals using pre-published scoring criteria set forth in this RFP and develop a score for each proposal from 0-100 points.

**Step 3:** The Commission shall negotiate, if necessary, and develop a contract and related documents, then submit the completed contract(s) to the Chairman.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this RFP, this RFP does not commit the Commission to make an award of a contract. The Commission reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to reject any or all proposals, or any portions thereof, for any reason, at any time, including, but not limited to, canceling the RFP, and to solicit new proposals under a new acquisition process.

Proposals shall be deemed incomplete and ineligible if information that is essential to the scoring evaluation is not included in the proposal. Proposals that fail to meet the following requirements will be deemed ineligible:

- Filing of a timely proposal and all mandatory elements;
- Identification of key personnel, and potential contractors or subcontractors, if applicable, or a detailed process and timeline to identify and engage any such contractors or subcontractors;
- Listing of key project milestones and the associated project schedule and timeline;
- Inclusion of a detailed budget plan and cost information; and
- Adherence to the District's contracting requirement of meeting the 35% certified business enterprise ("CBE") requirement

All proposals deemed ineligible shall receive notification of this determination in a timely manner.

Broadly, the Commission will evaluate all proposals received and deemed eligible based upon completeness, clarity, quality of the proposal, how well the proposal meets the approved VDER Study Scope and Timeline requirements, reasonableness of cost, the qualifications and relevant experience of the Study project team, and the likelihood of the VDER Study completion within the contract period. All proposals deemed eligible for consideration will be evaluated based upon the specific criteria identified.

If determined to be appropriate by the Commission, proposers may be invited to oral interviews. The Commission retains the sole discretion to determine whether to conduct oral interviews, with which proposers, and the number of interviews. Proposers are advised that interviews may be conducted with fewer than all proposers.

The purpose of oral interviews is to clarify and expound upon information provided in the written proposals. Proposers are prohibited from altering the basic substance of their proposal

during the oral interviews. Proposers may be asked to provide written clarifications of elements in their proposals, regardless of whether an oral interview will be conducted.

Information gained from oral interviews will be used to refine scores assigned after the Step 2 review of the Proposal.

#### **D.4.1. Scoring Criteria**

The Commission shall consider all of the following criteria, and assign a corresponding point score, where a maximum score for all criteria shall be 100 points. Cost is a consideration but may not be the determining factor in the selection of the VDER Study consultant. The Commission reserves the right not to consider any proposal with a total aggregate point score of less than 65 points. In addition, Offerors will be eligible to receive up to 12 preference points as described in **Section C** of this RFP for participation by Local, Small or Disadvantaged Business Enterprises. Thus, the maximum number of points possible is 112.

- 1) Qualifications, technical expertise, certifications, knowledge and practical experience that the consultant possesses, including that of the staff and any subcontractors assigned to the engagement, providing services directly relevant to the specified scope of services, including knowledge of distribution system, operational and resource engineering and planning, value of distributed generation or distributed energy resources analysis, utility distribution system marginal costs, avoided energy supply costs analysis, net energy metering of solar facilities, renewable energy systems development and operation, utility cost tests, and bill and rate impact tests. (Maximum Point Score: 25)
- 2) Clarity and appropriateness of proposed criteria evaluation approaches, general study approaches, and demonstrated knowledge of relevant subject matter. (Maximum Point Score: 25)
- 3) General experience and qualifications in providing similar services in the District of Columbia and surrounding jurisdictions as well as other states and to other utility commissions or regulatory agencies, including similar current or prior engagements and the positions publicly advocated in connection with such engagements. (Maximum Point Score: 15)
- 4) Cost of consulting services and expenses, including the competitiveness of the proposed fees and/or hourly rates and any proposed discounts or other benefits, and the overall quality of the proposed budget estimate. (The Commission reserves the right to negotiate lower fees or a different hourly rate structure than proposed, with any selected consultants.) (Maximum Point Score: 15)
- 5) Ability to work effectively in the District of Columbia, including familiarity with the District. (Maximum Point Score: 10)
- 6) Overall responsiveness to the requirements of the RFP, including completeness, clarity, and quality of proposal, including proposed allocation of resources and time to critical tasks and schedule. (Maximum Point Score: 10)

**D.5. Written or Oral Discussions**

Section 2202.12 of the Commission's procurement regulations permits the Contracting Officer to conduct oral discussions with Offerors that tender submissions.

**D.5.1. Award Without Discussions**

The Commission may award the prospective contract without either written or oral discussions. Therefore, each Offeror is advised that it should submit a complete and thorough submission that is fully compliant with the instructions in this RFP.

**D.5.2. Competitive Range**

If the Contracting Officer elects to hold discussions with Offerors, then discussions will be held with all Offerors in the competitive range, which will be established based on the evaluation criteria set forth in this RFP. Upon completion of discussions, the Contracting Officer will issue to all Offerors in the competitive range a request for best and final offers. After receipt of best and final offers, the Contracting Officer will not reopen discussions unless it is clearly in the best interest of the Commission to do so.

**D.6. Retention of Submissions**

All submissions shall be retained by the Commission and therefore shall not be returned to the Offerors.

**D.7. Examination of Submissions**

Offerors are expected to examine the requirements of all instructions (including all amendments, addenda, attachments and exhibits) in this RFP. Failure to do so shall be at the sole risk of the Offeror and may result in disqualifications.

**D.8. Late Submissions: Modifications**

Any submission or best and final offer received at the office designated in this RFP after the exact time specified for receipt shall not be considered. Any modification of a submission, including a modification resulting from the Contracting Officer's request for best and final offers, is subject to the same condition.

The only acceptable evidence to establish the time of receipt at the Commission is the time-date stamp of the Commission on the submission cover page or other documentary evidence of receipt maintained by the Commission. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this RFP to the contrary, a late modification of an otherwise successful submission that makes the terms more favorable to the Commission may be considered at any time it is received and may be accepted.

Submissions shall be irrevocable and remain in full force and effect for a period not less than 120 days after receipt of

**D.9. No Compensation for Preparation of Submissions**

The Commission shall not bear or assume any financial obligation or liability regarding the preparation of any submissions in response to this RFP or prepared in connection therewith,



including but not limited to any submissions, statements, reports, data, information, materials or other documents or items.

**D.10. Rejection of Submissions**

The Commission reserves the right, in its sole discretion:

- 1) To cancel this solicitation or reject all submissions.
- 2) To reject submissions that fail to prove the Offeror's responsibility.
- 3) To reject submissions that contain conditions and/or contingencies that, in the Commission's sole judgment, make the submission indefinite, incomplete, otherwise non-responsive, or otherwise unacceptable for award.
- 4) To waive minor irregularities in any submission provided such waiver does not result in an unfair advantage to any Offeror.
- 5) To take any other action within the applicable procurement regulations or law.
- 6) To reject the submission of any Offeror that has submitted a false or misleading statement, affidavit or certification in connection with such submission or this RFP.

**SECTION E. PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION AND SUBMISSION**

This section outlines specific information necessary for the proper organization of the Offeror's proposal and manner in which the proposal should be proffered.

**E.1. Submission Identification**

Submissions shall be emailed with the subject header: "Value of DER Study"

Submissions shall be emailed to:

Karen Hester  
Contract Specialist  
Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia  
1325 G Street, N.W., 8th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
[khester@psc.dc.gov](mailto:khester@psc.dc.gov)

**E.2. Date and Time for Receiving Submissions**

Submissions shall be received no later than 4:00 p.m., EST, November 2, 2020. Offerors assume the sole responsibility for timely delivery of their submission, regardless of the method of delivery.

### **E.3. Submission Size, Organization and Offeror Qualifications**

All submissions shall be submitted on 8-1/2" x 11" paper and typewritten. The Commission is interested in a qualitative approach to presentation material. Brief, clear, and concise material is more desirable than quantity. The submission shall be organized as follows:

#### **E.3.1. Table of Contents**

The pages of the proposal must be numbered with index tabs included for each section.

#### **E.3.2. Disclosure Form**

Each Offeror shall submit a Disclosure Statement substantially in the form of **Attachment B**.

#### **E.3.3. Executive Summary**

Each Offeror should provide a summary of no more than three pages.

#### **E.3.4. General Team Information**

Each Offeror should provide the following information for the principal firm and any subconsultants or joint venture partner firms:

1. Name(s), address(es), and role(s) of each firm (including all sub-consultants)
2. Firm profile(s), including:
  - a. Firm size
  - b. Organizational Structure
  - c. Areas of practice
  - d. Office location(s)
  - e. DC Certified Business Enterprise (provide certification, if applicable)
  - f. Please include a copy of the Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy, if available.
3. Corporate Information

Offerors, if incorporated, shall attach to the proposal, a current franchise tax Certificate of Good Standing, issued by the District of Columbia Comptroller's Office. Offerors shall provide to the Commission, Offeror's 9-digit Federal Employer's Identification Number (FEI#) or Social Security Number (SSN) if Offeror is an individual. If a domestic corporation, Offerors shall also provide to the Commission the corporation's charter number issued by the District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs. If a foreign corporation, Offerors shall also provide to the Commission a copy of a valid Certificate of Authority to do business in the District of Columbia, issued by the District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs.

### **E.3.5.Experience and Past Performance**

The Offeror should submit information consistent with the requirements delineated in **Section D.4.1**

### **E.3.6.Price**

The Offeror shall submit Attachment A, Form of Offer Letter and Bid Form. PRICE PROPOSAL INFORMATION SHALL BE SEPARATED FROM TECHNICAL PROPOSAL INFORMATION.

### **E.3.7.Tax Affidavit**

Each Offeror must submit a tax affidavit substantially in the form of Attachment C. In order to be eligible for this procurement, Offerors must be in full compliance with their tax obligations to the District of Columbia government.

## **SECTION F.      GENERAL REQUIREMENTS**

### **F.1.      Contact Person**

Any company or person wishing to obtain clarifying information about this RFP may submit inquiries in writing to:

Karen M. Hester

Contract Specialist

Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia

1325 G Street, N.W. 8th Floor

Washington, D.C. 20005

[khester@psc.dc.gov](mailto:khester@psc.dc.gov)

#### **F.1.1. Questions**

All inquiries must be made on or before **October 9, 2020**, to the attention of Karen M. Hester at the above-stated Commission's office or email address. RFP No. PSC-20-23, must be identified as the subject. Answers to all written questions timely received will be issued by Addendum and posted on the Commission's Contracting and Procurement webpage, at [www.dcpsc.org](http://www.dcpsc.org) under RFP No. PSC-20-23.

### **F.2.      Explanations to Prospective Offerors**

Offerors should carefully examine this RFP and all amendments, addenda, or other revisions, and be thoroughly familiar with all requirements prior to proffering a submission. Should an Offeror find discrepancies or ambiguities in, or omissions from, the RFP and amendments, addenda or revisions, or otherwise desire an explanation or interpretation of the RFP, any amendments, addenda, or revisions, it must submit a request for interpretation or correction in writing. Any information given to an Offeror concerning the solicitation shall be furnished promptly to all other Offerors as an amendment or addendum to this RFP if, in the sole discretion of the Commission, that information is necessary in proffering submissions or if the lack thereof would be prejudicial to any other prospective Offerors. Oral explanations or instructions given before the award of the contract shall not be binding.

### **F.3.      Protests/Disputes**

Protests and disputes shall be governed by Sections 2206 and 2207 of the Commission's Procurement regulations (15 DCMR §§ 2206-7). As provided in Section 2206.1, protests alleging defects in this solicitation must be filed within ten (10) business days of the solicitation. If an alleged defect does not exist in this initial RFP but was incorporated into the RFP by an amendment or addendum, a protest based on that defect must be filed before the next closing time established for proffering submissions. In all other cases, a protester shall file the protest within ten (10) days after the protester knows or should have known,

whichever is earlier, of the facts and circumstances upon which the protest is based. All protests must be made in writing to the Office of the Commission Secretary and must be filed in duplicate. Protests shall be served on the Commission by obtaining written and dated acknowledgment of receipt from the Office of the Commission Secretary. Protests received by the Commission after the indicated period shall not be considered.

To expedite handling of protests, the envelope shall be labeled "Protest." The written protest shall be signed by the protester or its representative and shall include at a minimum the following:

1. The name, address, and telephone number of the protester;
2. Appropriate identification of the procurement, i.e., the RFP number and, if a contract has been awarded, its number;
3. A concise statement of the grounds for the protest and a specific request for a ruling from the Chief Contracting Officer of the Commission; and
4. Supporting exhibits, evidence or documents to substantiate any claims, unless not available within the filing time, in which case the expected availability date should be indicated.

**F.4. Authority**

This Request for Proposals ("RFP") is released pursuant to the Commission's procurement regulations, 15 DCMR § 2200 *et. seq.* (2000), which is published on the Commission's website at [www.dcpssc.org](http://www.dcpssc.org) or click on <http://dcpssc.org/PSCDC/media/PDFFiles/Procurements/Chapter22.pdf>.

**F.5. Time**

Unless otherwise specified in this RFP, time, if stated in number of days, shall include Saturdays, Sundays and holidays.

**F.6. Licensing, Accreditation and Registration**

The selected Offeror shall comply with all applicable District of Columbia and federal licensing, accreditation, and registration requirements and standards necessary for the performance of the contract.

**F.7. Limitation of Authority**

Only the Commission or a person with prior written authority from the Commission shall have the express, implied, or apparent authority to alter, amend, modify, or waive any clause or condition of the contract. Furthermore, any alteration, amendment, modification, or waiver of any clause or condition of this RFP is not effective or binding unless made in writing and signed by the Commission or its authorized representative.

**F.8. Conformance with Laws**

It shall be the responsibility of the selected Offeror to perform under the contract in conformance with the Commission's procurement regulations and all statutes, laws, codes, ordinances, regulations, rules, requirements, orders, and policies of governmental bodies, including, without limitation, the U.S. Government and the District of Columbia

government; and it is the sole responsibility of the selected Offeror to identify the procurement regulations, statutes, laws, codes, ordinances, regulations, rules, requirements, orders and policies that apply and their effect.

**F.9. Statement Regarding Potential Conflicts of Interest**

Each Offeror shall identify any relationships between itself or its employees and the companies under the jurisdiction of the Commission, or any parent, subsidiary or affiliate, of such companies. The extent, nature and time aspects must be identified. If there have been no such relationships, a statement to that effect shall be included in the proposal. Failure to provide the statement on potential conflicts of interest will automatically disqualify the Offeror.

**F.10. Financial Capability**

The selected awardee may be required by the Commission to describe their financial capability to complete the work required and to sustain operations for the term of the contract. Acceptable evidence of financial capability may include, if requested, an audited financial statement within the past 12 months from a certified public accountant.

## **SECTION G. INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS**

### **G.1. Required Insurance**

The Consultant will be required to maintain the following types of insurance throughout the life of the contract.

#### **G.1.1.**

Commercial general public liability insurance (“Liability Insurance”) against liability for bodily injury and death and property damage, such Liability Insurance to be in an amount not less than One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) for liability for bodily injury, death and property damage arising from any one occurrence and One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) from the aggregate of all occurrences within each policy year. The policy should include completed operations coverage and must be maintained for a period of at least three (3) years after substantial completion occurs.

#### **G.1.2.**

Workers’ compensation and Employers Liability coverage providing statutory benefits for all persons employed by the Offeror, or its contractors and subcontractors at or in connection with the Work.

#### **G.1.3.**

Automobile Liability, including Hired and Non-Owned Auto Liability in the amount of at least One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) for each occurrence for bodily injury and property damage.

#### **G.1.4. Additional Insurance**

Each insurance policy shall be issued in the name of the Consultant and shall name as additional insured parties the Department and the District of Columbia and shall not be cancelable or reduced without thirty (30) days prior written notice to the Commission.

### **G.2. Waiver of Subrogation**

All such insurance shall contain a waiver of subrogation against the Commission and the District of Columbia, and their respective agents.

### **G.3. Strength of Insurer**

All insurance shall be placed with insurers that are reasonably acceptable to the Commission and with an A.M. Best’s rating of not less than A- (Excellent) and a surplus size of not less than XV. All such insurers shall be licensed/approved to do business in the District of Columbia.