PUGET SOUND ENERGY

2025 Distributed Solar and Storage RFP:

Exhibit A. Evaluation Criteria and Scoring

Evaluation Criteria and Scoring

PSE's evaluation of distributed solar and storage is based on a quantitative, qualitative and technical assessment of all proposals that meet the minimum requirements of the DSS RFP. The quantitative and qualitative evaluation criteria assess the feasibility of proposals and measure each proposal's ability to satisfy compatibility with resource need, cost minimization, equity principles outlined in Clean Energy Transformation Act (CETA)[1] and Cascade Natural Gas Order,[2] risk management, and strategic and financial considerations.

As described in Section 4 of the DSS RFP, proposals are scored and evaluated based on their quantitative and qualitative metrics. The proposals are scored and ranked according to the weighted average of their price (quantitative) and non-price (qualitative) elements. The weights of the price and non-price scores in the combined scoring are 60% and 40%, respectively. Only those proposals that satisfy the RFP minimum requirements will receive a qualitative or quantitative score. The evaluation team will continue to check for any non-conforming criteria or fatal flaws throughout the evaluation process. PSE will use the results of the individual quantitative analysis, qualitative evaluation and technical studies to identify the short list of proposals.

A key element of this RFP is the equitable development and inclusion of renewable energy resources onto the grid. Details on the involvement of named communities, inclusion of DEI contracting practices and implementation of appropriate labor standards are further provided in the Qualitative Metrics section and Table 3 of this Exhibit.

Offers to the Targeted Substation Capacity solicitation will use the same Exhibit B as the system wide solicitation, and indicate in field "System-wide or targeted substation capacity offer?" on tab "2b. Offer Details" that the proposal is for this Section 3: Targeted Substation Capacity Solicitation. These proposals will be scored using the same process as the system wide solicitation, but they will only be compared amongst themselves, separately from the pool of proposals in the system wide solicitation. For the Targeted Substation Capacity initiative, further detailed in Section 3 of the main body of the RFP, PSE may include the specific substation benefits of deferred upgrades in its analysis of projects. This targeted initiative is a priority of PSE, so we advocate that all bidders consider applying.

Intake Process

After proposals pass through the automated intake process (described in Section 4 of the DSS RFP), the evaluation team will conduct a preliminary screening to verify that the minimum criteria have been met, and to check for non-conforming criteria or fatal flaws that would eliminate

[1] RCW 19.405.040(8)

[2] WUTC v. Cascade Nat. Gas Corp., Docket UG-210755 Final Order 09 (August 23, 2022)

proposals from further consideration. Common examples of non-conforming criteria or fatal flaws include, but are not limited to: proposals with insurmountable or otherwise prohibitive feasibility constraints, resources that are not CETA-compliant, commercially unproven technology, excessive counterparty risk, safety risk, and regulatory or legal risk associated with noncompliance that could adversely affect PSE. A Schedule 152 application is not required to submit a proposal, but any project that is shortlisted will require a Schedule 152 application to be submitted quickly after shortlist notification. Any proposal identified to have non-conforming criteria or fatal flaws will be notified and given three (3) business days to remedy (the "cure period").

Evaluation

PSE will perform an initial analysis of the proposal to confirm that the minimum criteria of the RFP are met. After the initial analysis is complete, PSE will begin its quantitative and qualitative evaluation, likely seeking multiple clarifications from bidders to better understand the proposals provided. This evaluation will produce a list of the most promising resources for shortlisting. For this DSS RFP, the quantitative cost analysis will account for 60% of the proposal's score, and the qualitative analysis will account for 40% of the score.

PSE will notify all bidders of their acceptance to or rejection from the shortlist, and will require bidders to submit a Schedule 152 interconnection application to remain a shortlisted proposal and proceed into contract negotiations. The Schedule 152 application will need to be completed through the PowerClerk portal at http://www.pse.com/distributedrenewables. PSE strongly recommends all Respondents begin compiling materials for the Schedule 152 application prior to receiving the shortlist results, but to not submit an application until receiving an award notice.

Those who are shortlisted and submit a Schedule 152 application will then be invited to begin contract negotiations by redlining the appropriate contract template listed in Exhibits F through H or an updated template if PSE has made alterations. Note that proposals may be rejected if PSE's preliminary assessment of interconnection scope shows excessive anticipated costs.

Quantitative metrics and price score (60%)

The quantitative metrics assessed are expected costs associated with the capacity and energy prices offered for each response. PSE will use the DER Benefit Cost Analysis ("BCA") methodology developed for the 2021 CEIP and used in the 2022 DER RFP, 2023 DSS RFP, 2024 DSS RFP, and 2023 Biennial CEIP Update to model the costs and benefits of each proposal. The BCA methodology used by PSE aligns directly with guidance outlined in the Washington State Utility and Transportation Commission's November 7th, 2022 Distributed Energy Resource Cost Effectiveness Straw Proposal.[3] The BCA methodology analyzes both the utility's and customers' economic perspectives and the interdependencies between the two. The BCA was selected as

[3] UE-210804 WA Test Straw Proposal: https://apiproxy.utc.wa.gov/cases/GetDocument?docID=103&year=2021&docketNumber=210804

the primary framework for the DSS RFP for this ability to model both customer and utility economic impact as well as calculate cost tests that align with practices outlined in the National Standard Practice Manual (NSPM).[4] To align with existing PSE modeling practices, where possible, the BCA utilizes the most updated base Aurora modeling assumptions as per the ISP development process. Table 1 lists major elements quantified in the BCA model: the host customer, utility, and societal costs and benefits. The BCA methodology quantifies each of these costs and benefits, when applicable, and applies cost tests consistent with the NSPM. The Societal Cost Test (SCT) is a pertinent indicator of cost effectiveness in our analysis. Proposals may be required to meet a minimum threshold value to be shortlisted, which PSE reserves the right to set.

Table 1. ***BCA Methodology Costs and Benefits***

Costs	Benefits
Utility initial capital outlay	Utility reduced system peak capacity
Utility grossed-up return on asset base	Utility reduced transmission and distribution peak
Utility O&M costs	DER generation hedge value
Utility PPA payments	Utility flexibility benefit
Utility owned/operated battery energy storage system charging costs	Customer backup power savings
Host customer initial capital outlay	Societal greenhouse gas benefits
Host customer program participation costs	
Host customer battery energy storage system market purchase charging costs	
Host customer O&M	

See Appendix D of the Biennial CEIP for more details on PSE's approach to the evaluation process and BCA methodology. PSE will score responses based on the cost metrics shown in Table 2 from the BCA analysis.

Table 2. ***Metrics calculated by BCA to assess RFP proposals***

Metric	Description	Value
Societal Cost Test (ratio)	A ratio of the net present value of societal benefits over societal costs.	Higher is better. Useful for comparing project costs and benefits from different perspectives.

[4]See National Standard Practice Manual For Benefit-Cost Analysis of Distributed Energy Resources August 2020, nationalenergyscreeningproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/NSPM-DERs_08-24-2020.pdf

Metric	Description	Value
Total Resource Cost Test (ratio)	Provides the combined benefit-cost perspective of utility system and participants, including non-energy impacts.	Higher is better. Useful for comparing project costs and benefits from different perspectives.
Levelized Cost of Energy/Capacity ($/kW; $/kWh)	Represents the average cost per unit of energy or capacity required to install and operate a resource.	Lower is better. Includes the costs of the resource over its economic operating life, amortized over the lifetime and discounted back to the first year, divided by the total lifetime energy produced.

Qualitative metrics and non-price score (40%)

PSE has developed a qualitative rubric designed to assign value and score certain key non-price elements of resource proposals that meet the following minimum requirements. The qualitative review will include an assessment of the risks, benefits and viability factors set forth in the qualitative evaluation rubric provided in Exhibit A, including: counterparty and project viability, status of site control, status of permitting, deliverability, and Equity Questionnaire. PSE will score proposals based on the information provided by Respondents and any further due diligence required to verify that the information provided is accurate and complete. In conducting due diligence and risk assessment, the DSS acquisition team will consult as necessary with subject matter experts from specific functional areas throughout PSE. Certain elements in the qualitative rubric may not apply in the same manner to all types of resources.

Depending on whether the project is a solar, storage or paired project, it can potentially bring unique benefits to the local electric system. PSE will provide location value scoring for projects that consider available locational data, including: hosting capacity, distribution substation loading, and named communities. The Hosting Capacity Analysis Map ("HCA Map") shows the potential for a DER to be installed at a location without requiring significant infrastructure upgrades.[5] The distribution substation load map includes peak substation loading data for both summer and winter and shows areas of the distribution system that would benefit from DER resources.

[5] *https://pugetsoundenergy.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=980fc190ffd648489a492f8363a1d2cc*.

In the HCA Map, PSE has included the DER Priority filter, which gives a simple "Yes" or "No" response per feeder. Projects sited in a designated "Yes" location will receive additional points in their evaluation for interconnecting onto a feeder that could benefit from a DER. There is also a Generation in Queue filter in the HCA Map, which depicts the amount of MWs trying to interconnect onto the feeder and substation. Locations with a lot of DERs in queue to interconnect, such as near Dieringer Substation by Lake Tapps, will receive less points in the evaluation and require potentially expensive system upgrades to interconnect.

PSE will perform additional due diligence, where necessary, to understand the unique risks and merits of particular proposals, verify proposal claims, clarify offer details, and answer any outstanding questions. To do this, the evaluation team may:

- submit data requests to respondents for clarification of proposal details or for further information to help illuminate the particular risks and benefits of proposals,
- discuss elements of the proposals with respondents by phone,
- draw on publicly available and non-confidential information as per the Mutual Confidentiality Agreement (Exhibit D) to better understand key elements of the proposals, and
- utilize a third-party consultant to help assess the reasonableness of resource data.

The resource evaluation team will assign qualitative scores based on the information that respondents provided in their proposals, as well as PSE's experience in the market, as a resource owner/operator and program implementer, and on publicly available information. The evaluation team will also consult as necessary with subject matter experts from specific functional areas throughout the company.

PSE's qualitative scoring rubric is provided as Table 3 on pages A-12 to A-16. Respondents should note the following:

- All proposals must be for a project that directly connects to PSE's VPP, EMS and/or SCADA. In this RFP, PSE is not seeking aggregated resources bundled under cloud-based software solutions.
- PSE will grade projects on their locational value, refer to PSE's HCA map.[6] The HCA map displays hosting capacity, distribution substation loading and named communities. Picking an identified priority feeder at a location with ample hosting capacity will increase the proposal score.
- Any proposal that receives a score of "0" in any sub section of the Permitting, Project Viability, or Site Control Status sections will be deemed to have failed to meet the minimum criteria of the 2025 DSS RFP and disqualified from further consideration

[6] *https://pugetsoundenergy.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=980fc190ffd648489a492f8363a1d2cc*.

(provided that such failure to meet minimum criteria has not been remedied within the three-business-day cure period).

- For categories that require a greater degree of judgement in assessing risk (Counterparty Viability, Project Viability and Equity Questionnaire), the rubric indicates factors that the evaluation team will consider when assigning appropriate scores. Respondents should therefore ensure that the information in their responses adequately addresses these factors.

PSE will use information provided by the respondent as well as information available in the public domain to make an informed evaluation of the maturity and readiness of the proposal in the categories of counterparty viability, project viability, site control/customer acquisition status, permitting status, energy delivery, and equity questionnaire. PSE will evaluate each proposal based on the merits of the quality and completeness of information sought in each of those categories. The information provided below serves to aid respondents to build as complete a proposal as possible in order to achieve the highest qualitative score attainable for their project.

A. Counterparty viability

Experience

- Direct experience implementing similar size and technology deployment in the United States
  - Summary CV of all key project team members
  - Company structure and organization
  - List of previous projects and technology types, linking key project team members if applicable
- Previous safety performance record

Counterparty stability

- Credit history and stability
- Financial reports/10K/ CPA certified for previous 3 years
- Material legal proceedings within past five years. (PSE will generally consider legal breaches of greater than $5 million to be material)

B. Project viability

Financing plan

- Project financing
- Project's development history
- Project's ownership taxonomy
- Interconnection and transmission cost with studies complete

Technology risk

- Installed project lists

C. Site control

FTM Resources

- Description of how sites will be identified
- Evidence of local community support for the proposed project
- For larger sites or those further along in planning
  - Binding letters of land use agreement
  - Non-binding letters of land use agreement
  - Ownership documentation

D. Permitting and studies

- State and/or federal discretionary permits
- Commercial and/or residential permits

E. Energy delivery

Locational value based on HCA map

- DER priority designation on HCA map
- Whether there are any DERs in queue where the project is being sited

F. Equity Plan and Rubric

Respondents to the 2025 DSS RFP are required to submit an Equity Plan, along with a completed Equity Rubric that addresses the questions outlined in Exhibit B tab 2c. Equity Plan and Rubric. To support PSE's evaluation of the credibility and viability of each Equity Plan, bidders are strongly encouraged to provide additional materials with further details, as appropriate. These materials should describe how equity considerations have been (or will be) integrated into the planning, development and implementation of projects.

The Equity Plan should be guided by the core energy justice tenets outlined in the WUTC v. Cascade Natural Gas Corporation, Docket UG-210755 Final Order 09, dated August 23, 2022[7] and the provisions outlined in RCW 19.405.040(8) of the CETA[8], which states that:

In complying with this section, an electric utility must, consistent with the requirements of RCW 19.280.030 and 19.405.140, ensure that all customers are benefiting from the transition to clean energy: Through the equitable distribution of energy and non-energy benefits and reduction of burdens to vulnerable populations and highly impacted communities; long-term

[7] WUTC v. Cascade Nat. Gas Corp., Docket UG-210755 Final Order 09 (August 23, 2022)
[8] RCW 19.405.040(8)

and short-term public health and environmental benefits and reduction of costs and risks; and energy security and resiliency.

PSE will evaluate and score each respondent's equity considerations using the established scoring rubric. Scores will reflect how effectively the Bidder identifies and explains specific strategies for addressing the four tenets of energy justice, the CETA customer benefits, and the integration of diversity, equity and inclusion in their business practices and programs. PSE will also assess the Bidder's commitments to implementing these strategies and documenting the contributions of the proposed project.

The Energy Justice tenets are recognition, procedural, distributive, and restorative. Recognition Justice requires an understanding of historic and ongoing inequalities and prescribes efforts that seek to reconcile these inequalities. Procedural Justice focuses on inclusive decision-making processes and seeks to ensure that proceedings are fair, equitable, and inclusive for participants, recognizing that marginalized and vulnerable populations have been excluded from decision-making processes historically. Distributional Justice refers to the distribution of benefits and burdens across populations. This objective aims to ensure that marginalized and vulnerable populations do not receive an inordinate share of the burdens or are denied access to benefits. Restorative Justice involves using regulatory government organizations or other interventions to disrupt and address distributional, recognition, or procedural injustices, and to correct them through laws, rules, policies, orders, and practices. Your responses will ensure that named communities and historically disadvantaged populations will be identified and included in the consideration process, establishing an on-going effort to engage and embrace community participation.

CETA creates an inclusive approach to clean energy. It also requires that all customers benefit from the transition to the 2030 carbon-neutral standard and the 2045 requirement for non-emitting and renewable electric resources. Identifying, measuring, and applying customer benefits is a new part of the electric resource planning and resource acquisition process beginning in 2021. The 2023 Clean Energy Implementation Plan (2023 CEIP) includes customer benefit indicators (CBIs) by categories; these categories are: (1) Energy and non-energy benefits, (2) Reduction of burdens, (3) Environmental Burdens, (4) Public Health, (5) Energy Security and Resiliency are directly derived from the statutory language in RCW19.405.040(8), which outlines how utilities must ensure all customers benefit from the clean energy transition. PSE developed the specific metrics within these categories through engagement with its Equity Advisory Group (EAG) and customers during the 2021 CEIP process. CBIs are discussed in detail in Chapter Six of PSE's 2023 Biennial CEIP Update, including Table 6.1, which shows the most recently approved list of CBIs.[9]

[9] https://www.pse.com/-/media/PDFs/CEIP/2023/001_BU23_Chapters_Final.pdf

Terminologies used

Charitable donations may include any donations that can benefit local community charities.

Customer Benefit funds may include any additional funds that the developer will contribute to the CETA CBI categories.

Tax revenue may include property tax or other local tax benefits.

Priority Populations Impact

Bidders should state if they intend to build in a named community (see PSE named communities mapping tool[10]) and describe the direct impact, potential barriers, and mitigation strategies that their project will provide. For projects located within the state of Washington, PSE uses the term "Named Communities" to refer to two priority groups: Highly Impacted Communities and Vulnerable Populations. See PSE Named Communities map tool.

Highly impacted community is defined with at least one of the following criteria: (a) the census tract is covered or partially covered by 'Indian Country' as defined in and designated by statute; (b) the census tract ranks a 9 or 10 on the Environmental health Disparities Map, as designed by the Washington State Department of Health (DOH).

Vulnerable Populations refers to population groups that are more likely to be at higher risk for poor health outcomes in response to environmental harms, due to adverse socioeconomic factors, limited access to nutritious food and adequate health care, linguistic isolation, and other factors that negatively affect health outcomes and increase vulnerability to the effects of environment harms, and sensitivity factors such as low birth weight and higher rates of hospitalization, RCW 70A.02.010(14)(a)(b). Vulnerable populations are broken out into high medium and low levels as referenced in the 2023 Biennial CEIP Update, Chapter 3[11].

For projects located outside the state of Washington, PSE uses the term "Disadvantaged Communities". This refers to those that are marginalized, underserved, and overburdened by environmental pollution, including low-income communities, communities of color and tribal and indigenous communities.[12] See the unofficial archival Climate and Economic and Justice Screening Tool to identify Disadvantaged Communities.

[10] PSE Named Communities Mapping tool https://pugetsoundenergy.maps.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?webmap=55b43c36edd44731992f4e207dc19f70

[11] https://www.pse.com/-/media/PDFs/CEIP/2023/05_BU23_Ch3_Final.pdf

[12] Communities that are disadvantaged live in tracts that experience burdens. These tracts are highlighted on the map: Explore the map - Climate & Economic Justice Screening Tool

Forms and Filing Instructions

The Equity Plan and the Equity Rubric are documents expected to be completed for each proposal.

For the Equity Rubric, an explanation of each of the questions is expected in the proposal Equity Plan as a justification for the bidder's score. We expect bidders to cite the specific section in their Equity Plan that PSE should refer to when evaluating their proposal.

Key concepts and definitions for Clean Energy Job metrics

Clean Energy Project refers to a project that demonstrates 1 or more of the following technologies: (a) Solar; (b) Micro-grids; (c) Geothermal; (d) Direct air capture; (e) Electric vehicles -EVs; (f) Battery storage, including pumped storage hydropower and compressed air storage; (g) Advanced nuclear technologies. It can also be defined as a project that generates, stores, or supports the use of renewable or low-carbon energy sources such as solar, wind, hydro, or battery storage systems.

Clean energy jobs includes jobs in the solar energy, wind energy, energy efficiency, energy storage, solar thermal, green hydrogen, geothermal, electric vehicle industries, other renewable energy industries, industries achieving emission reductions, and other related sectors including related industries that manufacture, develop, build, maintain, or provide ancillary services to renewable energy resources or energy efficiency products or services, including the manufacture and installation of healthier building materials that contain fewer hazardous chemicals. Clean energy jobs also include administrative, sales, and other support functions within these industries and other related sector industries.

Full-time jobs refer to workers who work 35 or more hours per week.

Part-time jobs refer to workers who work fewer than 35 hours per week.

Ongoing/full time jobs refer to long-term employment positions with full-time hours and ongoing duration, not tied to a specific project timeline.

Temporary or Contingent jobs refer to workers holding positions that do not have an implicit or explicit contract for ongoing employment. These are short-term jobs tied to specific projects or phases, such as construction or installation, often ending when the project is completed.

Workforce development programs refer to programs that provide training, education, and career support to help individuals gain skills for in-demand jobs and meet the workforce needs of local industries. Services may include continuing education, industry-recognized certifications, specialized skills training, and apprenticeship programs.

State's minimum wage is defined as the lowest hourly wage that employers can legally pay workers in a particular state. For instance, Washington State has a minimum wage[13] of $16.66 per hour, beginning Jan 1, 2025.

Living wage is defined as the minimum hourly amount that a full-time worker must earn to afford necessities in a specific geographic area.

[13] Washington State Department of Labor & Industries, Minimum Wage. https://www.lni.wa.gov/workers-rights/wages/minimum-wage/

Table 3. *Qualitative scoring rubric*

Evaluation Categories	Weight			Points
Counterparty Viability *Screening based on 2 key areas listed below. The total sum is applied towards this category.*	**10%**	**x**	**0**	**_ / 6**
Experience Level				
Bidding Entity (company) has no demonstrable experience implementing **at least 1** similar size and technology deployment				1
Bidding Entity (company) has demonstrable experience implementing **< 3** similar size and technology deployment				2
Bidding Entity (company) has demonstrable experience implementing **≥ 3** similar size and technology deployments				3
Counterparty Stability				
Bidder assessed to have weak or limited financial profile and/or has been engaged in recent material disputes or legal proceedings				1
Bidder assessed to have an acceptable financial profile and/or has not been engaged in recent material disputes or legal proceedings				2
Bidder assessed to have a strong financial profile and has not been engaged in recent material disputes or legal proceedings				3
* Material legal proceedings within past five years. PSE will generally consider legal breaches of greater than $5 million to be material				
Project Viability *Screening based on applicable areas listed below. The total sum of the respective applicable areas is applied towards this category.*	**10%**	**x**	**0**	**_ / 5**
Financing Plan				
Plan provided but no actionable progress made				1
Project Financing yet to be achieved but in progress				2
Balance Sheet Financed or Financial arrangement established				3
Technology Risk				
Unproven technology: non-commercial or minimal deployment history				0
Limited commercial development: some commercial deployments, and limited track record				1
Proven commercial technology: extensive deployment history with strong track record				2
* PSE may differentiate between technology upgrades and new classes of technology in assigning scores for deployment				
Site Control *For PSE Owned projects, PSE will require developers to provide, at a minimum a signed option to lease within 30 days of shortlisting notification*	**20%**	**x**	**0**	**_ / 3**
Project Site				
No executed land agreements / Not feasible				0
Preliminary site control secured (e.g. signed Letter of Intent)				1
Substantial progress in complete site control (e.g. signed Option to Lease)				2
Site control complete (e.g. owned property)				3
Permitting and Studies *If Applicable*	**15%**	**x**	**0**	**_ / 2**
Project is sited in a city or county with a moratorium (temporary or permanent) on the development of the resource				0
Project is sited at a location that will require a SUP, CUP or other additional discretionary process to permit the resource				1
Project is sited at a location that permits the development of the resource				2
Energy Delivery *A Schedule 152 application is required for all shortlisted proposals*	**20%**	**x**	**0**	**_ / 3**
Is the resource connecting to a DER Priority feeder based on the HCA? *(for both Solar and BESS)*				
No				0
Yes				1
Is the total project MW is less than or equal to the available hosting capacity at the point of interconnection taking into account the MWs of projects in queue on the circuit (*for both Solar and BESS*)				
Yes				0
No				2

EXHIBIT A: EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

	Evaluation Categories	Weight		Points	
	Equity Rubric	25%	x		_ / 55
Number	Question	Evaluation Criteria	Assigned Scores	PSE Assessment	Notes
1	Will the project impacts/affects Vulnerable Population (high level)?	Project will not impact or will have negative impacts to Vulnerable Population (high level)			
	https://pugetsoundenergy.maps.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?webmap=55b43c36edd44731992f4e207dc19f70	Project has recognized positive impacts to Vulnerable Population (high level)	1		
2	For projects located in Washington State, has the location been designated as a highly impacted community in the Department of health's Cumulative Impact Analysis?	Yes	1		
	https://doh.wa.gov/data-statistical-reports/washington-tracking-network-wtn/climate-projections/clean-energy-transformation-act/ceta-utility-instructions	No			
3	Will the project impacts/affects highly impacted communities (HIC)?	Project will not impact or will have negative impacts to HIC			
		Project has recognized positive impacts to HIC	1		
4	Describe in detail, any potential environmental or social impacts the project may have on surrounding communities.	No analysis /studies have been conducted			
		Have positive env or social impacts	1		
		Have negative env or social impacts			
5	What is involved in your public participation process or engagement plan? Including but not limited to: provide objective information; obtain feedback; work directly with stakeholders throughout the process ensuring that concerns and aspirations are understood and considered; partner on decision making; implement what stakeholders decide; or additional process involvement	A detailed engagement plan included	2		
		A general engagement plan included	1		
		Did not include or will not have any engagement plan			
6	Who is involved in your decision making? Including but not limited to: PSE Service area customers, community members, tribes, Named Communities, or additional participants	Provided types of members included in the decision making	1		
		Did not include anyone in the decision			
7	What is the project strategy for decision making? Including but not limited to: plan to invite and encourage participation from a diverse range of people, employ various tools and techniques to gather input from participants, foster dialogue among the participants and the decision-makers, document the decision and the rationale behind the decision include community feedback, and additional comments	A detailed decision making plan included	2		
		A general plan included	1		
		No plan was included			
8	Does the project support the deployment of clean, renewable energy as defined in CETA[1]? Provide information on the capacity of the project, how the proposed resource improves or will improve the equitable distribution of energy benefits to all customers including highly impacted communities, vulnerable population (high level).	Details included	2		
	[1] This includes energy generating sources that do not emit greenhouse gases (GHG) as well as renewable resources such as (a) water, (b) wind, (c) solar energy, (d) geothermal energy, (e) renewable natural gas, (f) renewable hydrogen, (g) wave, ocean, or tidal power, (h) biodiesel fuel that is not derived from crops raised on land cleared from old growth or first grown forest, or (i) biomass energy, as defined in RCW 19.405.020	General information included	1		
		Did not include any information			

9	Describe how the proposed resource improves the equitable distribution of non-energy benefits to highly impacted communities and vulnerable populations?	Significant non-energy benefits will go to highly impacted communities, vulnerable population (high level)	2		
		Some non energy benefits will go to highly impacted communities, vulnerable population (high level)	1		
		None of the non energy benefits will go to highly impacted communities, vulnerable population (high level)			
10	Is the bidding entity a women -, minority -, disabled- and /or veteran-owned business? Per WAC480.107.145(2)(f)	If yes, specify relevant demographics below			
		Women owned	1		
		Minority owned	1		
		Disabled owned	1		
		Veteran owned	1		
		none			
11	Does the developer utilize or has the developer utilized diverse businesses, including (but not limited to), women-, minority-, disabled-, and veteran-owned businesses in the past? If yes, Provide a summary description	yes	1		
		no			
12	Does the developer intend to seek out and utilize diverse businesses including (but not limited to), women-, minority-, disabled-, and verteran-owned businesses for the proposed resource? If yes, provide details	yes	1		
		no			
13	Provide the number or percentage of contract awarded by clean energy projects to businesses that are women-owned, veteran-owned, minority-owned. Include information whether these are awarded to businesses in or outside of named communities, or disadvantaged communities, and contract value compared to the overall project cost (without the cost of equipment).	Details included	2		
	* (exhibit A) The term “clean energy project” means a project that demonstrates 1 or more of the following technologies: (a) Solar (b) Micro-grids (c) Geothermal (d) Direct air capture (e) Electric vehicles -EVs (f) Battery storage, including pumped storage hydropower and compressed air storage. (g) Advanced nuclear technologies. It can also be defined as a project that generates, stores, or supports the use of renewable or low-carbon energy sources such as solar, wind, hydro, or battery storage systems	General information included	1		
		Did not include any information			
14	Are there estimated local employment impacts from the proposed resource? If yes, provide details	yes	1		
		no			
15	Provide information on the number of jobs (direct and indirect) created by clean energy projects in named communities or disadvantaged communities	Details included	2		
		General information included	1		
		Did not include any information			
16	Provide the number and percentage of ongoing or permanent full time or part time jobs by clean energy project	Yes	1		
		No			
17	Provide the number and percentage of temporary or construction jobs by clean energy project	Yes	2		
		No	1		
18	Provide information on the number of jobs created by clean energy projects located in named communities	Details included	2		
		General information included	1		
		Did not include any information			

19	Provide the demographic data (e.g. age, race, gender) of workers created by clean energy projects as is permitted under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act.	Details included	2		
	US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. https://www.eeoc.gov/statutes/title-vii-civil-rights-act-1964	General information included	1		
		Did not include any information			
20	Provide the number and percentage of jobs created by clean energy projects that pay at or above the 130% of the respective state's minimum wage	Yes	2		
		No	1		
21	Does the developer intend to comply with the labor standards in RCW 82.08.962 and RCW 82.12.962?	yes	1		
		no			
22	Does the developer offer diversity training for its employees?	yes	1		
		no			
23	Does the developer have a written diversity commitment, policy or plan? If yes, provide details	yes	1		
		no			
24	Does the developer participate in any programs that offer apprenticeship or workforce development specifically to minorities and/or women? If yes, provide details	yes	1		
		no			
25	Provide the number or percentage of clean energy related workforce development programs	yes	1		
		no			
27	Provide the number or percentage of individuals from named communities or disadvantaged communities participating in clean energy related workforce development programs	yes	1		
		no			
28	Provide the estimate project budget (dollar amount) on clean energy workforce development programs in named communities or disadvantaged communities	yes	1		
		no			
29	Will the proposed resource or project provide additional economic benefits (e.g. Local tax revenues, customer benefit funds, charitable donations) to Named Communities (highly impacted communities, vulnerable population - high)? If yes, provide details	Details included	2		
		General information included	1		
		Did not include any information			
30	Describe how the proposed resource reduced burdens to highly impacted communities, vulnerable population (high level)? Includes reduction of energy bills or reduction of energy use.	Details included	2		
		General information included	1		
		Did not include any information			
31	Provide details on environmental impacts of the project, focus on CO2 avoided emissions.	Details included	2		
		General information included	1		
		Did not include any information			
32	Describe any known environmental burdens to highly impacted communities, vulnerable population (high level) with the project, include reducing biological resources, or ecologically sensitive areas, soil or geographic topographic elements, noise levels, coastal use or resources	Details included	2		
		General information included	1		
		Did not include any information			
33	Describe or outline strategies implemented, or will be implemented, to mitigate or reduce any identified environmental burdens.	Details included	2		
		General information included	1		
		Did not include any information			
34	Provide project details on how it may improve outdoor air quality? Including but not limited to: NOx, SOx, and PM 2.5	Details included	1		
		General information included			
		Did not include any information			

35	Describe how the proposed resource may help maintain or strengthen the energy security and resiliency of highly impacted communities, and vulnerable population-high level	Will Strengthen (positive impact)	2		
		Will maintain (neutral impact)	1		
		Will not maintain nor strengthen (negative impact)			
36	How would the proposal address and rectify practices that perpetuate inequities, specifically examining named communities? Including but not limited to : decrease energy burden, decrease environmental exposure and burdens, increase clean energy jobs, job pipeline, and job training, increase clean energy enterprise creation and contracting minority, named communities, increase energy democracy, increase access to low cost capacity, increase reliability, resilience, and infrastructure to support reliability and resilience, or additional information	Details included	2		
		General information included	1		
		Did not include any information			
37	What steps will be taken to generate meaningful and enduring changes? Including but not limited to using supportive information from US Environmental Impact Assessment; Energy Financial Reserve Obligation; Examine Social License to Operate (ongoing acceptance of standard business practices); Department of Health requirements for public health; Dept of Energy on overburden zone; Dept of Transportation PHMSA; or additional information.	Details included	2		
	See Energy Equity Project Framework section 2.4 part two (Preventive Measures for additional information) https://energyequityproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/220174_EEP_Report_8302022.pdf	General information included	1		
		Did not include any information			
38	What equity considerations will be included for future proposal development? Including but not limited to: Empower customers to be an active decision maker; address intergenerational sustainable outcomes; address equitable access and accountability; or additional information	Details included	2		
		General information included	1		
		Did not include any information			

Shortlist Selection

Prior to shortlist selection, bidders may be interviewed in order to clarify aspects of their business and offer, including but not limited to: demonstrated competence and experience, management structure and assigned personnel, quality of proposed equipment and services, pricing, and performance guarantees.

PSE reserves the right to conduct additional due diligence, as necessary, for the shortlisted proposals. This may include engaging with respondents regarding various aspects of the proposals to verify proposal claims with supporting data and documents from the respondent, engaging third-party consultants to independently verify resource performance, or using other publicly available information. Proposals that PSE determines present unacceptable risks, or that otherwise fail to meet the minimum proposal requirements defined in Section 5 of the DSS RFP will not be selected for the short list. Proposals that are not cost-effective will not be selected for the short list. All Respondents will be notified of their selection status at the end of the evaluation.

A redline review of the agreements provided in Exhibits F through H are not required pre-shortlisting, but are appreciated and will be reviewed if provided. Once a proposal is shortlisted, the bidding entity will be invited to begin contract negotiations. PSE reserves the right to suspend negotiations with any Respondent and initiate discussions with an alternate shortlist candidate

at its sole discretion and in the best interests of the Company and its customers. Execution of a contract may be held pending the results of any on-going study.

The timeline of key milestones is provided in Table 6 of the main RFP document.