

1. We understand from the kick-off call that PURA is currently using an internally developed BCA model for the CRE Report. Is it possible to share the existing BCA model, and/or provide a general overview of the tool and its limitations?

**PURA does not currently have a BCA model for the CRE report. In Year 1, financials were not included. In Year 2, the Authority included links to the EDCs responses regarding program costs for each Clean Energy Program, as well as a link to the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) Connecticut Energy Profile Analysis. However, no BCA model has been included to date.**

**A BCA model has, however, been developed by the Connecticut Green Bank and used in their evaluation of the Energy Storage Solutions Program. Links to public filings containing that model can be found through the following link:**

**<https://www.dpuc.state.ct.us/dockcurr.nsf/8e6fc37a54110e3e852576190052b64d/d645a7e8cbbc5d5f852588a700554341?OpenDocument>**

2. Regarding Task I.A, in order to confirm consistency with the CT Green Bank Energy Storage Solutions Program, will the consultant have access to that model and its input data/assumptions in order to perform validation tests?
  - a. If validation tests identify issues with the existing model, will there be opportunities to work directly with Guidehouse Consulting to support remediation?

**The consultant will have access to the same information regarding the CT Green Bank model as the Authority and as provided in the hyperlinks included in the above response. The consultant may work with Guidehouse Consulting to the extent Guidehouse is willing, but the Authority will not directly compensate them for their time.**

3. Are there any data sources that PURA anticipates will be necessary for the BCA model that PURA does not already have access to, and expects the consultant to provide?

**There are no data that the consultant is expected to provide. However, the consultant is expected to bring knowledge of BCA modeling principles and, if necessary, work with the Authority to issue additional interrogatories to procure any necessary data from the EDCs to perform BCA modeling.**

4. Task IV-Policy Review is discussed as a task that would be done “as time and budget permits”. Our initial point of view is that developing a separate module, or extension of the BCA model, would likely require its own project plan and scoping to ensure it is truly adding value beyond the primary BCA model. Understanding that this task is not the primary objective of the RFP, would PURA be open to considering this Task as an optional line item in the budget?

**Yes**

5. Regarding Task I.G, does PURA already have an IMPLAN license that would be accessible by the consultant, or should the cost of a license be included in the proposal?

**PURA does not have an existing IMPLAN license. Consultant proposals should include the cost of an IMPLAN license, if necessary.**

6. Can the Authority provide relative emphasis (e.g., percentage weighting) of the various desired qualifications?
  - a. Credentials
  - b. Approach
  - c. Grasp of Scope
  - d. Cost effectiveness

**These criteria are weighted equally in the Authority's review of proposals.**

7. On the benefit-cost analysis model:
  - a. Can the Authority describe the types of inputs and/or level of granularity it envisions the model being designed for? For example, would inputs be at the resource/measure level (e.g., quantity of heat pumps through Conservation & Load Management Plan, lists of individual Energy Storage Solutions projects, etc.) or more aggregated (e.g., total avoided capacity benefits for the Conservation & Load Management Plan)?

**The Authority anticipates that the inputs will generally be at the resource level, but is most interested in the results on a program level. For instance, the storage BCA initially used projections for the number and size of projects to determine the program BCA. As the program has developed, the BCA has been updated with data from approved projects. Currently, each Clean Energy Program has project selection and/or deployment data which can be utilized to help develop the BCA.**

- b. Given relevant discussions in Docket 22-08-08, when calculating emissions reductions, capacity prices, energy prices, price effects, etc., is the consultant expected to rely primarily on the Avoided Energy Supply Costs (AESC) figures, or is the Authority seeking alternative methodologies?

**The Authority seeks the development of a benefit-cost analysis model that will allow comparison among Connecticut programs. The AESC is currently utilized in other state energy programs' cost-benefit analyses and therefore is expected to be the source for those effects. However, if the consultant has a strong preference for an alternative source, please provide a description and justification for that source.**

- c. Developing a single, user-friendly BCA model that works across various program types (EV charging, energy efficiency, energy storage, renewables, etc.) within the \$200,000 threshold could present challenges. Would the Authority accept a proposal that would establish a model that establishes a common set of resource inputs that could work across programs/technologies, then assume that program administrators would be primarily responsible for manipulating program data to fit the BCA structure?

**The Authority would accept such a proposal, and notes that two of the criteria to evaluate proposals are the approach to performing the modeling, and the cost effectiveness of the bid. The Authority also notes that the BCA should mitigate the level of burden to perform and repeat modeling annually.**

- d. Relatedly, for programs that already calculate and submit BCAs to the Authority (e.g., Conservation and Load Management Plan), would the Authority be open to a proposal that envisions taking the outputs from the BCAs and incorporating them into the BCA model the Authority is procuring through this RFP?

**The Authority would be open to such a proposal, but notes that there should be as much consistency in methodology across BCA for various programs as possible in order to provide just and transparent comparisons across programs.**

8. For items such as reviewing Rate Adjustment mechanism hearings, to what extent does the Authority envision helping direct consultant towards most relevant documents, or having consultant review all documents?

**The Authority will assist the consultant in identifying the most relevant dockets and documents for their review.**

9. Can the Authority estimate the number of internal strategy meetings the consultant will be expected to attend?

**Consultants can anticipate at least a monthly strategy meeting, and more regular check-ins with lead Authority staff. As noted in the RFP in Section II.A.II.f, these meetings will be remote (i.e. virtual).**

10. Similarly, can the Authority estimate the number of hearings, technical meetings, late filed exhibit hearings, and oral arguments the consultant will be expected to attend? Further, is it correct to interpret the requirement to “attend” these meetings is a requirement to attend them in person?

**The Authority estimates this number to be zero, as no hearings, technical meetings, or oral arguments were held in Year 2 of the CRE Report docket proceeding. Nevertheless, if a technical meeting were to be held, the requirement would be to attend them. Any potential technical meetings would likely be virtual.**

11. The RFP states that the consultant will be responsible for “drafting or assisting Authority staff in drafting sections of the 2023 CRE Report.” Can the Authority provide an estimate of the percent of the overall report the consultant will be expected to draft?

**The consultant will likely be responsible for the initial drafting of the section pertaining to the BCA modeling, as well as aiding in the development of new visualizations and other enhancements to existing CRE Report sections. The Authority does not have an estimated percentage of the total report the consultant will be expected to draft.**

12. Does the Authority anticipate the need to budget for the consultant to provide training and support to Authority staff on the use and management of the BCA model?

**Proposals that include developing the BCA model should include expected budgets for at least basic training for Authority staff on the use of said model.**

13. The RFP requests a tool for evaluating future clean and renewable energy legislation “as time and budget permits.” Would a proposal that excludes this functionality, or offers it as an optional task on top of the core not-to-exceed value be considered responsive by the Authority?

**Yes. If the total proposal value exceeds \$200,000 to complete the scope of work and the additional scope for said tool, please indicate the specific cost for developing said tool.**

14. The RFP notes the statutory limit of \$200,000 per proceeding, which “can be exceeded for good cause.” If a respondent to the RFP determines that a fully responsive proposal cannot be provided for less than \$200,000:

- a. Will the Authority consider the proposal?
- b. Should the proposal include any additional information, e.g., demonstration of “good cause”? If so, can the Authority provide guidance (if any exists), on how to establish “good cause”?

**The Authority will make a good cause determination based on compelling evidence. See above for relevant responses to how respondents may choose to structure their proposal.**

15. Would PURA be amenable to extending the proposal due date by one week (to May 5<sup>th</sup>)?

**Yes. The Authority will update the RFP and RFP website accordingly.**

16. Are budgets limited to \$200,000? See page-8 mention of statutory requirement.

**See response to question 14.**

17. Page 8 says that we should provide “estimated hours” and “estimated reimbursable expenses”, but then goes on to say that we should include “all-inclusive maximum fee and out-of-pocket expenses”. Will work be invoiced on a time-and-materials, time-and-materials not-to-exceed, or fixed-price basis?

**Work will be invoiced on a time and materials basis with a not-to-exceed limit on total expenses.**

18. Please provide more details on the level of travel expected.

**No travel is expected.**

19. Are there Connecticut-specific travel rates that bidders should be aware of and use when estimating travel costs? If so, could you please point to them? I see that the standard terms mention that mileage will be reimbursed at current IRS allowances.

**See response to question 18.**

