

Stakeholder	Issue/Comment/Recommendation	PacifiCorp Response
Public Counsel		
1. Public Counsel	<p>Recommends approval with one condition: the Company provide a detailed description as to how the Company plans to conduct its evaluation of bids which would serve Washington customers.</p>	<p>This is the first time that PacifiCorp has issued an RFP in compliance with WAC 480-107 or in conjunction with a filed CEIP. Using the evaluation and selection process detailed in Section 6 of the RFP, PacifiCorp intends to first identify and select final shortlist for its six-state system, and second analyze the resources it would otherwise allocate to Washington on non-energy and CBI criteria using the Appendix P information.</p> <p>In consideration of Clean Energy Transportation Act (CETA) and its Clean Energy Implementation Plan (CEIP), PacifiCorp would only propose allocating renewable and non-emitting resources to Washington. Each of the proposed resources would have energy benefits that could be measured using the Appendix P information provided by bidders. With respect to non-energy benefits, if the resources proposed had alternative bids with differing amounts of contractor and supplier diversity consistent with the labor standards in RCW 82.08.962 and 82.12.962, then PacifiCorp would evaluate the relative price difference as compared with the associated non-energy benefit, and in coordination with the independent evaluator, PacifiCorp may elect to move forward with the bid alternative offering more diversity subject to any additional costs being within the cost allowable threshold for alternative compliance per RCW 19.405.060(3).</p> <p>Similarly, if there were customer benefit indicators from PacifiCorp’s CEIP that were not being met and resources demonstrating measurable progress towards those goals, and if there were resources offering significant non-energy impacts to vulnerable populations and highly impacted communities that had not been initially identified as recommended shortlist resources to be allocated to Washington customers, then PacifiCorp would in coordination with the independent evaluator, analyze the additional cost of adding such resources. PacifiCorp will use the responses in Appendix P and also the narrative responses in Appendix B-2 to make a recommendation.</p>

2. Public Counsel	The Company is requiring that all bidders fill out the questionnaire, which will be used in the evaluation process.	PacifiCorp is requiring all bidders proposing resources in Washington to fill out the equity questionnaire. Bidders proposing resources in other states are requested to complete the questionnaire and receive a point in their non-price score as incentive to do so.
WUTC Staff		
3. WUTC Staff	Staff concern whether the existing wording of the RFP may discourage potential demand-side bids	It is not PacifiCorp’s intent to discourage potential demand response bids and so we are proposing changes to RFP language to address. We are also clarifying how any potential need for additional DR resources will be considered following the ongoing process of contracting demand response resources from the 2021 DR RFP. See item 5 below regarding WA conservation resources.
4. WUTC Staff	The Commission has not approved PacifiCorp’s CEIP. Subsequent regulatory action taken regarding PacifiCorp’s CEIP may impact customer benefit and equity requirements of this RFP. In the event CEIP developments require adjustments to the final RFP bid solicitation, evaluation, and selection process through the end of 2023, PacifiCorp must notify parties of changes per rule.	In the event that subsequent regulatory action taken by Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Commission or WUTC) impacts the customer benefit and equity requirements in the CEIP, PacifiCorp will notify parties of changes and require additional data in the Appendix P Equity Questionnaire.
5. WUTC Staff -Issue #1	PacifiCorp’s RFP is silent on many of the required “all source” resource types; to take one example, “distributed energy resources” is only mentioned in a footnote. Question of whether the RFP currently under consideration can be considered an “all-source” RFP as defined in rule.	<p>All resource types that may fill all or part of the characteristics or attributes of the resource need may bid into the all-source request for proposal (2022AS RFP); therefore, PacifiCorp has complied with the rules in that the proposed 2022AS RFP will accept all resource types bid.</p> <p>PacifiCorp views distributed energy as a supply-side resource eligible to participate in the 2022AS RFP as filed. In response to this comment and to further support PacifiCorp’s view, the Company has added additional references to distributed energy in the all-source RFP.</p> <p>PacifiCorp has included the 2021 Demand Response RFP as Appendix Q to accept demand response bids. The Company has further clarified that in the event additional demand response resource need is identified through Company planning processes, a voluntary targeted demand-side resource RFP will be issued by August 31, 2022.</p>

		In accordance with WAC 480-107-065 PacifiCorp is implementing a competitive procurement framework for conservation and efficiency resources as approved as part of the Company’s Biennial Conservation Plan in January 2022.														
6. WUTC Staff -Issue #1	Staff is concerned that evaluating demand-side bids submitted to this all-source RFP under one scoring rubric, while evaluating demand-side bids submitted in response to the forthcoming demand-side RFP under a second set of requirements, and yet modeling both sets of bids together with supply-side bids in the same modeling process, could create inconsistencies in how bids are treated.	<p>PacifiCorp will use a similar process to the 2020AS RFP process, which evaluated bids from the 2021 DR RFP in parallel with supply side bids from the 2020AS RFP.</p> <p>The non-price scoring rubric will be the same for demand-side resources bid into both the 2022AS RFP (which relies upon the Appendix Q 2021 demand response RFP) and the 2022 voluntary targeted demand-response RFP, which will be issued by the end of August 2022 in the event additional demand response resource need is identified through Company planning processes.</p> <p>The price scores for demand-side resources will be calculated at the same time and on equal footing using the same PLEXOS portfolio optimization tool and methodology across both RFPs. Any voluntary targeted demand response RFP will provide more information about PacifiCorp’s evolving need for demand-side resources and will offer a shorter schedule, because demand-response bids do not need to participate in the interconnection cluster study process.</p>														
7. WUTC Staff -Issue #1	Recommendation to delete the language “discouraging” demand-side bidders from bidding in the all-source RFP and allow bidders to bid into one or both RFPs.	PacifiCorp is deleting language that may be perceived as “discouraging” demand-side bidders and will allow for bidders to bid into one or both RFPs. See response to item 3 above.														
8. WUTC Staff -Issue #1	Recommendation to solidify and clarify the schedule for the demand-side RFP.	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Milestone – Voluntary Targeted Demand-Response RFP *</th> <th>Tentative Completion Date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Draft RFP issued for review</td> <td>May 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RFP Issued to market</td> <td>August 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Notice of Intent to Bid due</td> <td>September 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Last day for RFP questions for Q&A</td> <td>Sept - Oct 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RFP bids due</td> <td>November 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bid review, evaluation, and Q&A</td> <td>November 2022</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Milestone – Voluntary Targeted Demand-Response RFP *	Tentative Completion Date	Draft RFP issued for review	May 2022	RFP Issued to market	August 2022	Notice of Intent to Bid due	September 2022	Last day for RFP questions for Q&A	Sept - Oct 2022	RFP bids due	November 2022	Bid review, evaluation, and Q&A	November 2022
Milestone – Voluntary Targeted Demand-Response RFP *	Tentative Completion Date															
Draft RFP issued for review	May 2022															
RFP Issued to market	August 2022															
Notice of Intent to Bid due	September 2022															
Last day for RFP questions for Q&A	Sept - Oct 2022															
RFP bids due	November 2022															
Bid review, evaluation, and Q&A	November 2022															

		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Bidder price and performance update for IRP modeling</td> <td>January 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PacifiCorp provides supply-side and demand-side bid inputs to PLEXOS portfolio optimization modeling team</td> <td>February 2023</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PLEXOS generates price score and list of preferred new resources</td> <td>April 2023</td> </tr> </table> <p>*Issued in the event additional demand response resource need is identified through Company planning processes</p>	Bidder price and performance update for IRP modeling	January 2022	PacifiCorp provides supply-side and demand-side bid inputs to PLEXOS portfolio optimization modeling team	February 2023	PLEXOS generates price score and list of preferred new resources	April 2023
Bidder price and performance update for IRP modeling	January 2022							
PacifiCorp provides supply-side and demand-side bid inputs to PLEXOS portfolio optimization modeling team	February 2023							
PLEXOS generates price score and list of preferred new resources	April 2023							
9. WUTC Staff -Issue #1	Recommendation to elaborate on what information will be supplied with the targeted RFP that would be useful to demand-side resources. Doing so may have the effect of encouraging demand side resources to wait until later this year to bid, which would be acceptable if doing so would allow them to bid while having better information in hand.	By being issued at a later date, a voluntary targeted demand response RFP will provide the Company additional time to assess its resource need as the Company is currently in the process of procuring resources solicited in the 2021 demand response RFP. Furthermore, a later issuance date would allow for pricing information be more current, and demand response bidders would not have to go through processes that are not pertinent to how the company evaluates demand-side bids.						
10. WUTC Staff -Issue #1	Recommendation to evaluate demand-side bids using the criteria established in the 2022 demand-side RFP, rather than either the 2021 DR RFP or the 2022 demand-side RFP.	PacifiCorp agrees to update the 2022 all-source RFP Appendix Q if incremental demand response resources are identified in Washington as the Company finishes contracting for its 2021 demand response RFP.						
11. WUTC Staff -Issue #1	Recommendation to clarify the concurrent evaluation methodology for enabling bids from both this 2022 all source RFP and the subsequent demand-side RFP to compete on an equal footing during the PLEXOS bid shortlist optimization and development process	The results of the 2022AS RFP and a 2022 voluntary targeted demand response RFP will be evaluated in the same way. The non-price scoring will be complete for the demand response RFP because of the differing schedule; however, the price scoring will be conducted at the same time on equal footing via the PLEXOS portfolio optimization tool.						
12. WUTC Staff -Issue #2	Clarify that Appendix P is required and not requested.	The 2022AS RFP is compliant with WAC 480-107-025, which provides that an RFP “must request information.” The 2022AS RFP requests information detailed in WAC 480-107-025 and encourages bidders to provide Appendix P by assigning a non-price point for completing it. After the Commission has approved the utility’s first CEIP, the Appendix P will be updated						

		to contain information related to indicators approved in the utility’s most recent CEIP, including customer benefit indicators, as well as descriptions of all indicators. PacifiCorp has requested all such data points contained in its draft CEIP and is compliant with WAC 480-107-025.
13. WUTC Staff -Issue #2	Recommendation to add information requests for all bidders, including those bidding resources located outside of Washington, to submit the information requested in the “2 WA Resource Questions” tab of Appendix P.	The questions requested in “2 WA Resource Questions” tab of Appendix P are specific to the customer benefit indicators (CBIs) applicable to Washington CETA, which are not applicable to projects located outside of Washington. The majority of the non-energy indicators and CBIs are focused on local customer programs that are situs to each state, such as demand-side programs.
14. WUTC Staff -Issue #3	Staff recommends additional discussions regarding Appendices L and P. We suggest the Company re-evaluate how the equity questionnaire in Appendix P gets scored in Appendix L’s non-price scoring matrix. Recommendation that Appendix P have more weight than it currently receives.	Given its multistate approval process, PacifiCorp believes the allocated non-price points associated with completing Appendix P is appropriate. Bidders offering resources in Washington state will receive eight percent of their non-price score for addressing Washington equity priorities. Bidders offering resources outside of Washington will receive three percent of their non-price score for completing the equity questionnaire, which PacifiCorp believes is an appropriate motivation for bidders to provide a completed appendix. Bidders outside Washington can earn an additional four percent of their non-price score based on Washington equity priorities for a total of seven percent of their score.
15. WUTC Staff -Issue #3	Recommendation to make Appendix P should be a “minimum requirement” in Appendix L.	PacifiCorp is updating Appendix L so that Appendix P is a “minimum requirement” for bidders offering resources located in Washington state. Appendix P is an informational request PacifiCorp is making of bidders with resources outside of Washington in order to comply with evolving equity rules in several states. By assigning a point to its completion, PacifiCorp is signaling the importance to bidders and adequately incentivizing bidders to complete it. PacifiCorp does not believe it is appropriate to put one state’s regulatory requirements upon another state within its multistate approval process. PacifiCorp has customers in six different states with very different equity policies and priorities and does not want to create precedent by putting one state’s requirements on another.
16. WUTC Staff -Issue #3	Recommendation to differentiate one bid’s equity responses from another’s, likely via quantitative ranking and scoring methodologies. Staff is open	PacifiCorp will differentiate bidder’s supplier/contractor/workforce diversity strategy. Bidder’s will be allowed a free bid alternative to bid a different strategy at a different price. Ultimately, the

	to PacifiCorp’s suggestions on how to achieve these goals.	lower cost bid will receive a better price score, which may be offset by other non-price score weightings. After a final shortlist is recommended on behalf of the six-state system, in the event a lower cost alternative is selected which has a lower diversity strategy, PacifiCorp in coordination with the IEs may consider substituting the bid alternative with the higher diversity strategy.
17. WUTC Staff -Issue #4	<p>Recommendation to consider adding information request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The bidder’s previous experience implementing programs in partnership with diverse communities and entities (such as subcontractors), including women-, minority-, disabled-, and veteran-owned organizations and businesses. • Whether the bidder has a written diversity-equity-inclusion (DEI) commitment, policy, or plan, and whether bidder or project leadership have received DEI training. • Bidder employee diversity statistics 	<p>Added to the Appendix B-2 requirements.</p> <p>Added to the Appendix B-2 requirements.</p> <p>This request was included in PacifiCorp’s original filing and can be found in Appendix P and Appendix B-2.</p>
18. WUTC Staff -Issue #4	Consider awarding additional points in Appendix P for higher workforce standards or more robust CETA compliance.	<p>PacifiCorp has addressed this in two ways:</p> <p>First, bidders will receive a point in Appendix L non-price scorecard for meeting PacifiCorp's supplier diversity goals.</p> <p>Second, bidders who provide a free bid alternative will be evaluated based on the lowest cost bid alternative, which in the case of Washington resources, may be the more diverse bid alternative if they are able to take advantage of the tax credits available to them in RCW 82.08.962 and 82.12.962. If proposed for the final shortlist and for allocation to Washington, in consideration of non-energy benefits, PacifiCorp will evaluate the cost/benefit trade off and may elect to contract for a more expensive bid alternative which offers a more diverse supplier/contractor strategy.</p>
19. WUTC Staff -Issue #4	<p>Recommendation to add data requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What has the developer done to inform the local community of the project and project plans? Has the local community been receptive to the potential development? Have any groups or individuals objected 	These items have been added to the Appendix B-2 requirements.

	<p>to the proposed development? If so, what are their concerns?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asking the developer to provide a summary of community engagement for the project site and interconnect facilities to the point of the transmission system, along with any specific proposed adjustment to the project based on these engagement activities. This summary may include meeting dates, attendees, meeting minutes, community support or opposition. Asking the developer to provide copies of any letters, memos, emails, news articles, or other communications demonstrating the level of support by the local community. 	
20. WUTC Staff - Issue #5	<p>Recommendation that the Company incorporate the requirements of WAC 480-107-009(1) into PLEXOS as part of the optimization process, rather than evaluating them post-optimization</p>	<p>PacifiCorp has incorporated the requirements of WAC 480-107-009(1) in its scoring rubrics (RFP Section 6 Evaluation and Selection Process), which include a price-scoring, non-price scoring and ranking processes.</p> <p>PacifiCorp notes that the PLEXOS model is one step out of many steps required to produce the optimal outcome, and the focus of PLEXOS is on the valuation of all resources through the price scoring which may then be used in conjunction with non-price scoring to evaluate the requirements of WAC 480-107-009(1).</p>
Renewable Northwest		
21. Renewable Northwest	<p>Recommends the company relax its 2026 commercial-operation-date requirement</p>	<p>PacifiCorp will maintain its 2026 commercial operations date requirement for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The 2022AS RFP results from the resource need identified in the 2021 IRP process and is focused on the four-year CEIP action window through 2025. In addition, PacifiCorp is considering longer lead time resources such as pumped storage hydro as described in the 2022AS RFP. The farther out in time a bidder prices its bid, the more risk is associated with the cost curve assumptions. Customers may miss out on greater than expected cost declines. Customers may also

		<p>be at risk if a bidder is not able to meet its commitments because of price increases. If PacifiCorp were to accept bids with commercial online dates after 2026, it would want to include an appropriate risk premium in its evaluation models.</p> <p>3. Nearer term bidders are likely to have more mature bids with higher likelihood of viability and deliverability.</p> <p>4. 4. PacifiCorp will consider later in-service dates in subsequent RFPs and informed by shifts in action plan windows in subsequent IRPs..</p>
<p>22. Rene wable Northwest</p>	<p>Recommends the company relax its requirement that off-system bidders demonstrate long-term firm transmission rights</p>	<p>PacifiCorp has a large six-state territory with a vast transmission system capable of serving load and with sufficient resources available to it that it has received and been able to evaluate a sufficient number of competitive bids with the existing firm transmission requirement. During the prior 2020AS RFP, PacifiCorp received 43 bidders covering 275 base bids and 574 total bids.</p> <p>PacifiCorp regards conditional firm transmission as risky, because over a 20- to 30-year time horizon, non-firm transmission rights are likely to be unavailable when they are most needed. Further points to consider are provided below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conditional Firm is not “FIRM”. This service can be curtailed and downgraded to a lower grade of service for a defined # of hours per year (in the case of BPA system, specific to BPA system conditions). • There is no way to predict the expected long-term curtailment of such service, and history of such service has no bearing or measure regarding future curtailment. • Conditional Firm service does not include ancillary value because the asset is interconnect in a third-party balancing area, and therefore, PacifiCorp would need to carry additional reserves for resources offering this type of service.
<p>23. Rene wable Northwest</p>	<p>Recommends the company allow bids from DC-coupled as well as AC-coupled hybrid projects</p>	<p>To clarify, PacifiCorp is not considering hybrid resources as defined under CAISO but is instead requesting co-located resources so that PacifiCorp can dispatch the battery separate from the solar resource.</p> <p>The 2022AS RFP will be issued to market in the next few months and neither CAISO nor PacifiCorp</p>

		<p>Transmission have approved a DC revenue grade meter. Because there are no approved DC-side meters, PacifiCorp will require that all co-located batteries be AC coupled as part of this solicitation. In the event that CAISO approves a DC-side meter, PacifiCorp Transmission will then need to pursue a similar review process which could take up to one year.</p> <p>Should these hurdles be resolved prior to PacifiCorp's next RFP procurement process, PacifiCorp will endeavor to enhance its required specifications specific to DC-couple systems and modify current contractual arrangements to assure that these bids provide safe, cost-effective reliable services.</p>
<p>24. Rene wable Northwest</p>	<p>Recommends the company allow at least one alternative bid (beyond just a bidder's workforce plan).</p>	<p>During the prior 2020AS RFP, PacifiCorp received 43 bidders covering 275 base bids and 574 total bids. Some bidders spent material amounts of bid fees to offer more than a dozen different iterations of the same resource (facility).</p> <p>To evaluate, collate and analyze multiple bids takes time and resources. PacifiCorp now has three independent evaluators representing three states and bid fees are needed to cover each of those expenses. PacifiCorp encourages bidders to offer what they believe is their most competitive bid, or else pay for multiple bids.</p> <p>To date PacifiCorp has not received bids that offer different seasonal products.</p>
<p>25. Rene wable Northwest</p>	<p>Requests additional clarity on some of PacifiCorp's interconnection requirements -- specifically, the requirement of consistency between a project's nameplate capacity and its interconnection agreement, the eligibility of projects using surplus interconnection service, and the requirement that bid prices include interconnection costs.</p>	<p>A bid should be consistent with its interconnection study. If for example, a bidder offers solar collocated with battery storage along with an interconnection study that is for a standalone storage request, then PacifiCorp will require that bidder provide some documentation from PacifiCorp transmission confirming that no "material modification" is required. In other words, to be eligible for the RFP, the bidder will have to demonstrate that the interconnection study applies to the proposed resource and that no additional interconnection study is required.</p> <p>Projects using surplus interconnection service will be eligible so long as they have a study or other confirmation documentation from PacifiCorp Transmission which confirms the estimated cost and</p>

		online date for any required upgrades associated with the surplus interconnection service request.
26. Renewable Northwest	<p>Recommends additional resource procurement to help the company cost-effectively “use electricity from renewable resources and nonemitting electric generation in an amount equal to one hundred percent of the utility's retail electric loads” beginning in 2030. Further, because PAC notes in its 2021 Clean Energy Implementation Plan that its “forecasted incremental costs in the compliance years 2022 through 2025 ... would result in customer rate impacts of approximately 1.4 percent on average,” Renewable Northwest recommends because this forecasted incremental cost falls well below the two percent threshold for alternative compliance per RCW 19.405.060(3), the company consider increasing its investment in renewables and nonemitting resources during its first CETA compliance period.</p>	<p>PacifiCorp’s proposed 2022 all source RFP is consistent with the action items and window proposed in its 2021 IRP and CEIP.</p>
NIPPC		
27. NIPPC	<p>Recommends Commission approve the Draft RFP on a conditional basis and reserve the right to make revisions to accommodate potential changes to the Draft RFP in Oregon or Utah.</p>	<p>PacifiCorp believes its petition and corresponding draft RFP are consistent with the WAC 480-107 rules and should be approved at this time.</p> <p>PacifiCorp has experience in coordinating between multiple commissions in previous RFPs and has drafted the RFP to be compliant with rules in Washington, Oregon, and Utah.. PacifiCorp also notes that there is substantial overlap in the parties that submitted comments in the Washington and Oregon dockets for its 2022AS RFP – with the only differences being WUTC Staff and Public Counsel in Washington and OR Staff and NewSun in Oregon. Otherwise, NIPPC, Rye Development (Swan Lake and Goldendale), LiUNA, and Renewable Northwest all submitted comments, presumably with similar recommendations, in both jurisdictions. PacifiCorp will work closely with Staff and the WA IE regarding changes, if any, made by other commissions to the 2022AS RFP.</p>

		<p>In light of PacifiCorp’s multi-state jurisdictional RFP approval process and the new requirements stemming from WAC 480-107, it is important to have finality from WUTC in that they determine whether the RFP draft is compliant with Washington’s new purchases of energy rules and come to a decision as to whether to approve the RFP. Timing is essential. The last approval expected is from the Oregon commission on April 14, 2022. At which point the Company will have just 12 days to wait for the issuance of the final written Oregon Commission decision and then issue the 2022AS RFP on April 26 prior to the closing of the cluster study window on May 15, 2022. Bidders would find it valuable to have the RFP issued to market in order to determine whether to enter into the cluster study process.</p>
28.	NIPPC	<p>Recommends for future RFPs: 1) the Commission waive the WUTC rules regarding the RFP approval schedule; or 2) the Commission revise the WUTC rules to allow for a more robust RFP timeline that enables the Commission to take stakeholder comments in other states into consideration when issuing a decision on the RFP</p>
		<p>PacifiCorp appreciates WUTC’s attempt to create a cadence for RFP approval following an IRP filing by having the RFP follow the IRP with limited delay. For this process, the timelines have been set for Washington and other states within PacifiCorp’s multi-state jurisdiction. In future cycles, PacifiCorp would be supportive of limited adjustments to WAC 480-107 rules regarding timing requirements to prevent challenges within a multi-state jurisdictional process where regulated timelines are different.</p>
29.	NIPPC	<p>Recommends adding contingency cost adders to BTA bids to fairly compare them to PPA bids.</p>
		<p>Bidders may or may not include contingency cost adders to their bids. PacifiCorp does not agree that it should adjust any bid offering or otherwise weight the financial review. The operating assumptions used to evaluate BTA bids are subject to IE oversight. The ultimate merits of all bids requested for rate recovery should be based on the cost and benefits provided from our stochastic modeling, then ranked to determine a final shortlist in any RFP process.</p>
30.	NIPPC	<p>Recommends either the removal of terminal value assumption for BTA and benchmark bids, or else allow PPA bids to elect to a PPA renewal provision.</p>
		<p>PPA bidders may have included a terminal value assumption in the development of their offered PPA price – it is common for developers to make such assumptions. Therefore, to assure that all bid types are equally represented and valued, PacifiCorp will continue to include terminal value assumptions in both BTA and benchmark financial analysis.</p>
31.	NIPPC	<p>Recommends a maximum performance assurance to be \$100/kw before commercial operation, and</p>
		<p>PacifiCorp does not believe this is sufficient security to prevent bidders from speculating on resources they cannot achieve or otherwise prevent them from failing to perform. PacifiCorp has fully executed</p>

		\$50/kw afterwards. (vs. \$200 and \$100)	several PPAs over the past few years with these performance security provisions and have required the \$200/kw (development) and \$100/kw (operations) security requirements in all 2020AS RFP contracts.
32.	NIPPC	Commitment letter from qualified guarantor or lender not required prior to selection for the shortlist.	For bidders that are not providing their own credit support through an approved corporate guaranty, PacifiCorp requests bidders provide a letter of support from their expected security provider to ensure that they indeed have the ability to provide security consistent with what they have represented in Appendix D as part of their bid response. PacifiCorp does not require bidders to post any performance security until after the applicable contractual agreement is fully executed and effective.
33.	NIPPC	Price/non-price score ratio increased to 80/20.	PacifiCorp believes that a higher non-price score (75/25) is warranted to properly weigh important deliverability and equity characteristics.
34.	NIPPC	Extend COD requirement to December 31, 2028 for all resources.	See #21 above.
35.	NIPPC	Allow co-located renewable energy plus storage bids to include DC coupled storage resources.	See above.
36.	NIPPC	Accept conditional firm transmission as a form of firm transmission	See above.
37.	NIPPC	Allow different configurations of bids per project site without requiring the bidder to pay bid fees for each bid.	See above. To be properly considered, every bid configuration requires review of minimum criteria, due diligence, review, non-price scoring audit, PLEXOS bid preparation models, and PLEXOS analysis.
38.	NIPPC	Clarify what is meant when requiring nameplate capacity size of a bid to be “consistent and supported by the interconnection agreement(s).”	See above. No material modification or re-study by the PacifiCorp Transmission (or the applicable interconnection provider) is required.
39.	NIPPC	Allow off-system BTA proposals.	PacifiCorp is not accepting BTA proposals in the 2022AS RFP for resources not directly interconnected to PacifiCorp’s Transmission system. PacifiCorp does not desire to own generation resources where all ancillary value/benefits (including reserves) are realized by third party balancing authority. PacifiCorp will accept PPA proposal not directly interconnected to PacifiCorp’s Transmission system if bidder represents (and ultimately validates) firm

		transmission rights from third party transmission provider to PacifiCorp’s Transmission system.
40. NIPPC	Clarify how bids of different term length are evaluated on a level footing – <i>reference to the Boston Pacific paper.</i>	Consistent with prior RFPs, PacifiCorp financially reviewed all bids the same by considering the real levelized cost and the nominal system benefits over a similar term (e.g., contract term or asset life) to determine an unbiased present value net benefit. We suggest this evaluation method provides no inherent preferential or deferential treatment to bids of varying term lengths in that all bid results are present valued back to the same date certain.
WNIDCL and LIUNA (Labor)		
41. WNID CL and LIUNA (Labor)	Minimum bidder requirements to be uniform (across all 6 states) and reflect the highest contractor labor standards across its service territory.	PacifiCorp must comply with the various laws and regulations of all states where it does business, while also seeking balanced, least-cost, least-risk resources on behalf of its customers. In this environment, it would not be reasonable to make bidder requirements the same in all states.
42. WNID CL and LIUNA (Labor)	Amend Appendix L, “Non-Pricing Scoring Matrix,” Section I, Appendix P, “Equity Questionnaire,” to add a point to all-sited resources which complete a survey comparable to the Washington Equity Survey	Bidders offering resources located in Washington will be required to complete Appendix P as a minimum requirement. All bidders proposing resources in other states will receive a point for completing the Appendix P Equity Questionnaire.
43. WNID CL and LIUNA (Labor)	Amend Appendix L, Section II, to add a point to all-sited resources which agree to proforma contract terms which establish minimum Responsible Contractor Labor Standards comparable to those required in Oregon consistent with HB2021, including but not limited to: a 15% apprenticeship utilization rate, diverse recruitment and retention goals, employment of contractors with a history of compliance with federal and state wage and hour laws, payment of area wage standards and provision of healthcare and retirement benefits to	Oregon HB 2021’s labor standards apply exclusively to projects sited in Oregon. Other states may set their own labor requirements for projects sited in their territories.

	construction labor on the project, and a requirement that bidders attest to these standards or else provide a copy of a project labor agreement in lieu of attestation;	
44. WNID CL and LIUNA (Labor)	Amend Appendix L, Section III, to add a point to renewable generating facilities in a community afflicted with poverty or high emission levels according to that state’s department of health or department of energy in all states not just California;	The standards cited here apply only in California. Other states may set their own environmental and social/environmental justice requirements for projects sited in their territories.
45. WNID CL and LIUNA (Labor)	Amend Appendix L, Section III, to add a point to all facilities located in a highly impacted community or in proximity to a vulnerable population comparable to definitions in Washington State;	The standards cited here apply only in Washington. Other states may set their own environmental and social/environmental justice requirements for projects sited in their territories.
46. WNID CL and LIUNA (Labor)	Amend Appendix L, Section III, to add a point to all facilities which have demonstrated how it will provide non-energy benefits consistent with PacifiCorp’s customer benefit indicators as provided in its Clean Energy Implementation Plan;	Customer benefit indicators were developed in conversation with a Washington-located equity advisory group and a Washington public participation process, and therefore, may not be meaningful or appropriate in other states. Additionally, these customer benefit indicators were developed in compliance with CETA, which applies only in Washington.
47. WNID CL and LIUNA (Labor)	Amend Appendix L, Section III, to add a point to all facilities which have met Responsible Contractor Labor Standards including but not limited to apprenticeship and workforce requirements comparable to those required by HB2021 in Oregon	HB 2021’s labor standards apply exclusively to projects sited in Oregon. Other states may set their own labor requirements for projects sited in their territories.
48. WNID CL and LIUNA (Labor)	For the lowest-cost bids responsive to this RFP, recommends the Commission requires PacifiCorp to provide the labor costs assumptions for those projects to confirm the low costs are not coming at the expense of lowering quality jobs standards for construction workers employed on the project.	Each state has different regulatory requirements that protect the integrity of the bidding process to prevent the disclosure of confidential information about the bid.
49. WNID CL and LIUNA (Labor)	Recommends PacifiCorp support the needs of impacted communities in its RFP by prioritizing an equitable transition for displaced construction workers reliant on fossil fuel jobs as	PacifiCorp is a six-state utility and cannot prioritize or give preference to any individual locality.

	well as giving preference to bidders who commit to using local workers	
50. WNID CL and LIUNA (Labor)	For any projects included in Washington’s rates, recommends the Commission require quarterly reports of the number of local and state workers employed during the construction phase of the project	Each state has different regulatory requirements that protect the integrity of the bidding process to prevent the disclosure of confidential information about the bid.
51. WNID CL and LIUNA (Labor)	Amend Appendix L, “Non-Pricing Scoring Matrix,” to include a scoring factor that gives preference to bidders who commit to a workforce plan that recruits fossil fuel construction workers for job opportunities on renewable power projects	Different states have different regulatory priorities. Some portions of PacifiCorp’s territory may not have fossil fuel construction workers, and would they unfairly lose an opportunity to score a point?
52. WNID CL and LIUNA (Labor)	Amend Appendix P, “Equity Questionnaire,” to include under Facility Job Creation total employment of fossil fuel construction workers	Some portions of PacifiCorp’s territory may not have fossil fuel construction workers. This information may be considered confidential information by certain bidder’s and how they staff their sites may be considered by some bidders to be confidential information and a competitive advantage.
53. WNID CL and LIUNA (Labor)	Establish minimal contractor requirements within the RFP that promote employee safety and health best practices, provide transparency around safety and health violations, and discourage the use of temporary staffing agencies and contractors with a history of serious safety and health violations.	PacifiCorp has established safety plan guidelines for resources that will be utility owned. Further, PacifiCorp expects and requires bidders to follow all relevant laws; however, PacifiCorp does not have the ability to monitor or act as an enforcement agent for contracted resources which are not utility owned.
54. WNID CL and LIUNA (Labor)	Amend Appendix L, “Non-Pricing Scoring Matrix,” to include a scoring factor that gives preference to bidders who commit to a construction workforce plan that excludes the use of temporary staffing agencies as subcontractors;	Different resource types have different labor and cost considerations and this may not be appropriate for some bidders.
55. WNID CL and LIUNA (Labor)	Amend Appendix L, Section III, to include a scoring factor whereby the seller agrees to a proforma contract term which prohibits the use of general contractors who have been found in violation of serious safety violations within the past three years on similar projects	PacifiCorp is unclear how it would validate or enforce such a recommendation. To address safety, PacifiCorp has instead added fields to the Appendix L and Appendix P to i) request bidders provide their TRI versus the OSHA industry average for that company type, ii) provide a point of non-price score for bidders who demonstrate a TRI higher than industry average; and iii) ask bidders to confirm whether they record TRIs online using a

		<p>common reporting tool such as Veriforce. Additionally, PacifiCorp has requested bidders provide answers related to safety in their Appendix B-2 narrative.</p>
56. WNID CL and LIUNA (Labor)	<p>Recommends Commission requires PacifiCorp to include in the RFP an element that recognizes contractors who enroll their employees in: OSHA 10 training program, joint labor/management safety committees, joint labor/management apprenticeship programs, and other courses identified as essential to the safe and efficient installation of wind and solar power structures;</p>	<p>PacifiCorp’s has limited ability to monitor and/or enforce such requirements via a power purchase agreement.</p>
57. WNID CL and LIUNA (Labor)	<p>Recommends Commission requires PacifiCorp to file Health, Safety or Environmental Incident Notices of any observed Health, Safety or Environmental infractions by construction contractors on winning bids of this RFP</p>	<p>PacifiCorp’s has limited ability to monitor and/or enforce such requirements via a power purchase agreement.</p>
Swan Lake/ Rye Development		
58. Swan Lake/ Rye Development	<p>Supports an extended Commercial Operations Date (12/31/2028) for Long Lead Time Resources but not standard renewable bidders: “emphasize that such a concession for long lead-time resources is only appropriate for those types of resources that have longer procurement and construction timelines such as pumped storage and nuclear. To that end, the Projects would not support granting an extension of the commercial operation date to any other resource that is not impacted by these same timing considerations.”</p>	<p>PacifiCorp supports Rye’s/Swan Lake’s conclusion.</p> <p>PacifiCorp intends to clarify in the RFP document that “long lead time resources” are defined as those requiring a state or federal licensing process and a prolonged construction schedule outside the normal scope of wind/solar resource development cycles. Such federal licensing requirement do not include pursuing federal (BLM) land rights.</p> <p>Additionally, as part of the Oregon docket, another developer filed comments indicating 2026 was sufficient time.</p>
59. Swan Lake/ Rye Development	<p>Concerned with PacifiCorp’s Stated Preference for minimum storage duration and (implied preference for) collocated renewable generating resource.</p>	<p>PacifiCorp is updating the RFP documents to remove language that may have been misunderstood as pre-judging the RFP conclusion related to preferred storage configurations. Based on this and other stakeholder feedback, PacifiCorp will remove minimum requirements related to storage duration</p>

		<p>and battery storage energy capacity sizing of co-located systems. Bidders may review 2021 IRP preferred portfolio and resource tables to consider potential relative competitiveness of various storage configurations. As stated clearly stated in the RFP documents, PacifiCorp will review and evaluate all storage bids regardless of any stated preferences.</p> <p>The evaluation process of all bids, with and without storage, is identical; therefore, there are no potential biases. PacifiCorp’s evaluation of storage bids will be overseen by three independent evaluators (WA, OR and UT) who will insure there is no preferential treatment for one type of storage resource and/or configuration over another.</p>
<p>60. Swan Lake/ Rye Development</p>	<p>Timing-Related Concerns with Draft RFP. Recommends allowing opportunity for benchmark resources bids to be updated.</p> <p>“the Projects are concerned that benchmark bids are due on November 21, 2022, and those benchmark bids are scheduled to be reviewed by the Independent Evaluator by January 13, 2023, while bids from the market are due January 16, 2023, yet the final shortlist is selected April 24, 2023, and bids from the market aren’t validated until November 21, 2023.5 Thus, PacifiCorp is proposing to fully-evaluate and “fix” the benchmark resources as of January 13, 2023; however, market bids aren’t fully-evaluated and finalized for 10 more months—by November 21, 2023. The Projects suggest that fixing benchmark bids so early in this RFP process is unnecessary and could lead to PacifiCorp foreclosing opportunities for achieving cost savings on benchmark bids, either through improved technology and/or market prices, both of which have historically fallen over time. Instead, the Projects suggest that PacifiCorp incorporate a reevaluation process for benchmark bids into the Draft RFP timeline</p>	<p>PacifiCorp’s benchmark evaluation process is influenced by the Oregon and Utah procurement rules. Specifically, per OAR 860-089-0350 benchmark resource bids must be reviewed, scored and filed before market bids may be received and considered, and there are specific rules that must be considered related to changes during the evaluation and selection process.</p> <p>This said, where timing opportunities arise, we will endeavor to accelerate the current schedule where appropriate.</p> <p>Additionally, it appears from these comments, there may be a misunderstanding related to the bid validity date on November 21, 2023. The proposed schedule has bid evaluation complete and final shortlist recommendations made June 16, 2023. The bid validity is the date until which bidders must hold their prices prior to finalizing contractual agreements. Unlike the 2020AS RFP, there is not an opportunity for bidders to improve the prices bid after the bid deadline. PacifiCorp will evaluate and contract based on initial bid prices.</p>

	whereby the economics and technological assumptions for benchmark bids could be reassessed and confirmed closer in time to the finalization of bids from market participants (by November 21, 2023).”	
61. Swan Lake/ Rye Development	Timing-Related Concerns with Draft RFP. Remove the requirement to demonstrate ability to issue notice to proceed for construction by 2023.	Because of the long duration nature of long lead time resources, PacifiCorp needs some assurance that the resource is reasonably mature, is making progress towards completing development and will be able to start construction in time to meet the end of 2028 requirement. PacifiCorp will agree to removing the notice to proceed requirement from the RFP; however, in the pro forma term sheet, long lead time resources should provide a reasonable milestone schedule demonstrating their ability to meet their proposed online date.
62. Swan Lake/ Rye Development	Recommends allowing multiple iterations for single project under one bid fee.	See above. The 2022AS RFP process now includes three independent evaluators representing three states (UT, OR, WA). Therefore, our bid fee structure was revised to provide some reasonable assurance that these expected costs would be covered in conjunction with the 2022AS RFP process. PacifiCorp disagrees with Rye’s statement that requiring a separate bid fee for every iteration of a single generation asset is unreasonable. First, during the 2020AS RFP, more than one bidder provided bid fees in excess of \$250K as a result of providing individual project iterations. Secondly, the evaluation effort by PacifiCorp and IEs for each bid iteration requires the same effort and diligence because each iteration is treated as a unique individual bid. Lastly, PacifiCorp decided that our prior bid fee methodologies required simplification, from both a bidder and IE scope of work perspective, to eliminate misunderstandings and confusion encountered in the 2020AS RFP process.
63. Swan Lake/ Rye Development	Concerned about differences between PacifiCorp’s Assumed Battery Design Life in the IRP and the RFP. Recommends PacifiCorp modify its criteria for benchmark bids and evaluate all battery storage resources over a 20-year design life.	Consistent with the 2020AS RFP, the 2022AS RFP requires bidders offering PPA/tolling agreement structures to provide bids based on an “augmented” battery, which means the Seller is required to maintain the original battery capacity over the term of the agreement. By comparison, BTA resources bid un-augmented systems that enable PacifiCorp to determine the degradation and augmentation

		<p>schedule over the life the battery. PacifiCorp may elect to augment any BTA standalone storage resource to support the 25 year term proposed in Appendix O.</p>
64. Swan Lake/ Rye Development	<p>Requests confirmation that both Energy Resource Interconnection Service (“ERIS”) generator interconnection service and Network Resource Interconnection Service (“NRIS”) are eligible.</p>	<p>Confirmed. PacifiCorp is simply requesting that resources beginning their interconnection process request both ERIS and NRIS as part of their interconnection study request.</p>
65. Swan Lake/ Rye Development	<p>Requests more information as to how “Terminal Value” is calculated, how much value is assigned to various different types of resources, and why such terminal value is not offered to resources being proposed via tolling agreement or power purchase agreement.</p>	<p>The terminal value calculation in our build and transfer model has three components.</p> <p>The first component represents the value for transmission assets remaining at the end of the assumed life for the generating resource. These assets are assumed to have a 62-year life and their value determined by actual capital deployed. This is calculated as the remaining net book value adjusted for removal costs and for inflation at the time the generating resource is assumed to retire.</p> <p>The second component is based on the value of non-transmission assets remaining at the end of the assumed life of the generating resource. This is fully depreciated at the end of its book life (30-year book life for wind resources; 25-year book life for solar; other technologies may have other book lives); however, these non-transmission asset have a terminal value because the cost of these assets (i.e., roads, buildings, etc.) would not be incurred by a successor project. Therefore, the terminal value is equal to the original cost adjusted for inflation multiplied by the portion of the original life remaining; that is 15 out of 45 years for example.</p> <p>The third component represents the value of development rights (i.e., the project development costs and fees) which are escalated from the current value at inflation. PacifiCorp asset life assumptions for the second and third components are currently 30 years.</p> <p>The allocation of the total initial costs assigned to both non-transmission assets and the cost of development rights, specific to a wind asset, is currently derived from PacifiCorp’s knowledge and experience associated with the current construction</p>

		<p>of TB Flats I & II and Ekola Flats wind farms. If PacifiCorp received BTA offers from other technologies such as solar or pump storage, PacifiCorp will solicit specific cost information from the bidder specific to infrastructure costs such as roads, land rights, owned transmission assets, etc. and the estimated cost of development rights to derive an underlying value for these non-transmission assets.</p>
<p>66. Swan Lake/ Rye Development</p>	<p>Concern that some of the appendices to the Draft RFP appear to be missing.</p>	<p>All of the appendices were included in the filing. Please clarify what appendices are deemed to be missing. There are appendices imbedded in the “umbrella” document: <u>_PacifiCorp_2022AS_RFP_App_A-Q_Umbrella_Document_2022-02-16.doc”</u></p> <p>PacifiCorp is considering breaking out the appendices in the umbrella document into several individual documents.</p>