



**Questions and Answers
RFP 20-002
Western Riverside County Energy Resiliency Plan**

Date Released: September 30, 2020

1. The scope of work appears to be very prescriptive; given the limited budget available is WRCOG open to alternative approaches to the SOW?

Response: *WRCOG has released an Addendum No. 2 which includes a revised scope of work. Additionally, WRCOG is open to alternative approaches to the Scope of Work (SOW), however, WRCOG wants a similar or the same outcome: a high overview energy resiliency plan for selected facilities at each WRCOG member jurisdiction that identifies short and long term energy resiliency solutions, strategies, and/or projects.*

2. Did WRCOG leverage studies completed for other regions in developing the SOW in this RFP? If so, can WRCOG share which studies or regions they used as a template of basis for the SOW outlined in this RFP?

Response: *Yes, WRCOG utilized the following references: U.S. Climate Resiliency Toolkit, WRCOG's Resilient IE Toolkit, City of Berkeley Energy Assurance Transformation (BEAT) Microgrid Project, City of Culver City Microgrid Feasibility Report, and a City of Bay City, MI Request for Proposal (RFP) for System/Resource Assessment.*

3. We are concerned that the scope is too large for the proposed \$140k budget, and would WRCOG be open to receiving proposals that identify a sub set of the core tasks proposed that will still produce an actionable energy resilience plan? And/or are additional funds available?

Response: *See response to Questions #1.*

4. Given that the project is funded by a grant, can WRCOG explain why such a high % points are assigned to cost proposal?

Response: *The intent of the 20% scoring criteria assigned to Project Costs was to make sure that the proposed costs stayed within the allocated grant funding. WRCOG has revised the RFP scoring criteria to 10% for Project Costs and increased Technical Approach to 50%.*

5. To what extent does WRCOG anticipate the previous vulnerability and adaption studies will be used in this effort? Is there an intention to reevaluate the validity of these efforts or to build upon them?



Response: *WRCOG will rely on the Vulnerability Assessments from the Climate Action Plan (CAP) and Resilient IE Toolkit to complete a Literature Review in Task 1. There is no intention to reevaluate the validity of the prior documents, rather the intent is to build upon the existing VA and Adaption Strategies in the Resilient IE Toolkit to identify energy resiliency solutions, projects, and strategies. WRCOG has released a revised Schedule of Events and plans to release an Addendum No. 1 to the RFP 20-002.*

6. Task 5: What information on facility energy use will be made available? For example, facility-level or critical-load-level metering data. Will there be an expectation for the consultant team to fill gaps in data?

Response: *This information can only be shared with the expressed consent of the customer, in this case the WRCOG member jurisdictions are the customer. Western Community Energy (WCE), and Southern California Edison (SCE) can provide this information with the customer approval. This data may also become available to member jurisdictions as a result of the CPUC Proceeding 19-09-009 Phase 1 decision. If jurisdictions do not currently have this data, the consultant will be expected to coordinate with WRCOG Staff, the member jurisdiction, WCE and/or SCE to receive that energy use data.*

7. Task 5: What mapping or building design information will be made available to inform siting efforts?

Response: *The consultant will be expected to coordinate with WRCOG and its member to receive building design information to site resiliency solutions on existing buildings, facilities, and/or jurisdiction-owned properties. The consultant will also be expected to coordinate with WRCOG and its member jurisdictions to utilize the jurisdiction's building standards, development code, planning and zoning documents to site new energy resiliency projects and/or solutions.*

8. Task 5: What level of concept design is expected for proposed improvements for critical facilities? Can you provide an example of level of detail? Can you provide an rough level of expectation on how many facilities these concepts should be developed for?

Response: *Single-line diagrams (SLD) or schematics including how the facilities are interconnected, DER's, onsite generation, inter-facility distribution lines, the distribution equipment requiring installation, and key aspects of the design, such as voltage and capacity, will be acceptable. Concepts, schematics, and/or drawings will be developed for 3-5 facilities per member jurisdiction. Please see the studies referenced in the amended Task 1 Literature Review.*

9. Task 4 Vulnerability Assessment and Task 5 Adaptation Strategy appear to be very similar to tasks that were completed as part of the Resilient IE project earlier this year. Is the intent



of this project to develop new analyses and strategies that supersede the previous work or is there some other intent? Any clarification would be appreciated.

Response: *See response to Question #5.*

10. The long schedule and expansive scope are challenging to align with the fee. Is the WRCOG open to proposals with an alternative schedule and scope that matches the available funding?

Response: *See response to Questions #1.*

11. The \$140,000 budget is insufficient for the specified deliverables. Can WRCOG match that amount, and if not, to what extent can WRCOG contribute?

Response: *See response to Questions #1.*

12. If the budget cannot be increased, would WRCOG accept negotiating a reduced scope of work?

Response: *See response to Questions #1.*

13. Would the awarded firm be precluded from bidding on the individual projects?

Response: *No.*

14. For Task 5, is the expectation for responders to make site visits to critical facilities?

Response: *No.*

15. For Task 5, does the COG expect site specific feasibility studies for each member city?

Response: *Yes, the intent is to provide a site-specific energy resiliency strategy, plan, and/or projects for selected facilities in each member jurisdiction. However, we recognize that multiple sites and facilities may have similar or identical energy resiliency solutions, strategies, and/or projects. In those scenarios WRCOG will accept similar solutions for multiple sites. See response to Questions #1.*

16. For Task 5, will WRCOG be able to obtain existing DER location/details from SCE?

Response: *The consultant will be expected to coordinate with WRCOG and member jurisdictions as customers of SCE and/or WCE to receive DER locations/details. See response to question #6.*

17. Would per agency and per building (with assumptions) be an acceptable pricing approach for Task 5?

Response: *No.*



18. After a review of scope and deliverables, we feel that the NTE budget of \$140,000 is not sufficient. Is it possible for additional budget to be allocated to this effort? Or, could a replicable plan be put together for a single agency that could be utilized throughout the region?

Response: *See response to Questions #1 and #15.*