Q&A ID#	Date Q&A Submittted	Website Response Posting Date	Interpretted Primary Q&A Topic	Question	PacifiCorp Response
1	3/18/2020	3/25/2020	Interconnection	Presently, a bidder at a minimum must have submitted an Interconnection request to PAC Transmission on or before January 31, 2020 in order to be eligible to participate in the RFP?	That is correct for the interconnection transition cluster study and in compliance with PacifiCorp Transmission's proposed queue reform as filed with FERC on January 31, 2020.
2	3/18/2020	3/25/2020	Resource Types	Just looking around your site, I was curious if we would be the right fit to bid on a project. We are in the electrical steel business and currently provide a complete list of value added electrical steel opportunities; silk coil, shunts, notching, E's and I's, toroids, DG cores, POT cores just to name a little bit of our product offering. Knowing that we work with several power companies and power company suppliers, would this bid proposal webinar potentially be fit?	This RFP is for purchase of power or the asset so it is not a good fit for your business.
3	3/18/2020	3/25/2020	Interconnection	Will PacifiCorp accept proposals that are not in its interconnection queue as of January 31, 2020 Note that these projects will be similarly situated to many projects in PacifiCorp's interconnection queue as of January 31, 2020 in that they will lack information from PacifiCorp, re: the cost, timing and impact of their interconnection. Inclusion of such projects would broaden the pool of resources available to PacifiCorp and its customers?	PacifiCorp is only accepting bids in compliance with PacifiCorp Transmission's proposed queue reform as filed with FERC on January 31, 2020. Should a different date be established and approved by FERC prior to the RFP release in July 2020, PacifiCorp will comply in its RFP.
4	3/18/2020	3/25/2020	Agreements / Contracting	Will PacifiCorp accept proposals that propose contractual structures other than PPA, BTA, and BSA structures to the extent they benefit ratepayers?	PacifiCorp has proposed to only accept the structures as outlined in its presentation at this time. Bidders bear the risk of submitting a structure outside of what is proposed and being deemed non-conforming.
5	3/18/2020	3/25/2020	Geography	Will PacifiCorp accept/evaluate proposals for projects in "load pockets" other than those shown in slide 6 of the March 18, 2020 PowerPoint presentation? Such projects may offer benefits to ratepayers that were not addressed in the IRP.	PacifiCorp provided slide 6 as a locational guideline for bidders in submitting their projects. All bids will be accepted that meet the requirements established in the RFP.
6	3/10/2020	3/25/2020	Resource Types	Are you considering floating solar on your hydropower and/or pumped storage facilities in your upcoming RFP?	We are not seeking any new resources that will be collocated on any PacifiCorp owned resources in this RFP.
7	3/18/2020	3/25/2020	Agreements / Contracting	What is a Battery Storage Agreement? How is it different from a PPA or BTA?	The battery storage agreement covers the terms and conditions of a transaction including dispatch of a battery energy storage system. The RFP includes a form of PPA that contemplates colocation of a battery energy storage system. The RFP will also include a form of term sheet for a stand-alone battery storage agreement. PacifiCorp anticipates that the terms and conditions specific to battery storage, operation and dispatch are likely to be more heavily negotiated with selected bidders.
8	3/18/2020	3/25/2020	Off-System	Please explain why BTA bids must interconnect directly with PacifiCorp's system. Why would requiring a wheel disqualify a project?	A BTA that does NOT interconnect to PacifiCorp's system places the risk of securing a firm transmission path from the resource to PacifiCorp's system on PacifiCorp and PacifiCorp is not willing to accept the risk at this time to own and operate a resource in another utility's balancing area without firm transmission secured. PacifiCorp would not have sufficient time to secure long-term firm transmission service (wheel) during Phase I selection process.
9	3/18/2020	3/25/2020	Price Score	What is the definition of Customer cost?	Customer cost is more clearly defined in Q&A ID #14.
10	3/18/2020	3/25/2020	Price Score	How is operating reserve benefit calculated in PaR for the screening model?	The PaR model will be run with and without an incremental operating reserve resource (separately for PACE and PACW). An hourly reserve price will be calculated from those results. This is analogous to the studies of locational energy value.
11	3/18/2020	3/25/2020	Price Score	Does StorageVET dispatch all resources or only storage?	The model is a separate spreadsheet model that only dispatches battery storage (and potentially other dispatchable resources) and provides a dispatch profile along with an energy and reserve value.
12	3/18/2020	3/25/2020	Interconnection	Instead of looking at interconnection costs in the final shortlist only, could upgrade interconnection costs be considered for the initial shortlist? This could help screen out any bids with interconnection costs that are so high as to make them non-competitive.	The 2020AS RFP is drafted in contemplation that PacifiCorp Transmission's interconnection queue reform proposal will be approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission prior to release of the RFP to market in July 2020. Therefore, assuming PacifiCorp Transmission's queue reform proposal is timely adopted, interconnection costs are determined during Phase II of the RFP bid evaluation process, when the interconnection mastition cluster study is conducted on the Initial Shortlist. In accordance with the proposed interconnection queue process, at the completion of the transition cluster study, the Initial Shortlist would update bid pricing with interconnection costs, either from the transition cluster study, their executed LGIA, or from their facility study agreement from the serial interconnection process. In the event PacifiCorp Transmission's interconnection queue reform proposal is not approved in time for the RFP's planned release in July 2020, the RFP eligibility and evaluation process will be reconsidered and revised as appropriate. For example, please see Q&A response 46 below.
13	3/18/2020	3/25/2020	Price Score	Does the screening model really output project capacity contribution? If so, how?	The capacity contribution values specific to each bid will be calculated using the same methodology used in PacifiCorp's 2019 IRP. Please refer to Volume II, Appendix N for details. The 2019 IRP uses a capacity factor approximation method (CF Method) to assign capacity contribution values to each resource based on the loss of load probability (LOLP) in each hour. Under the CF Method a resource's expected hourly generation profile is compared against weighting factors obtained by dividing each hour's LOLP by the total LOLP over the period The hourly LOLP values are not location specific, and reflect events across PacifiCorp's entire system. However, as a result of differences in hourly generation profiles, renewable resources in diverse locations have varying capacity contributions, even if they have the same annual capacity factor. Because the output of PacifiCorp's existing portfolio of renewable resources is reflected in the LOLP results, with lower LOLP values being more likely when their output is high. As a result, wind and solar resources that have shapes that are less correlated with the existing wind and solar assets in PacifiCorp's portfolio will have relatively higher capacity contributions.
14	3/18/2020	3/25/2020	Price Score	Why is the price score based only on capacity net costs without considering energy net costs?	The price score is based on the total net costs, including capacity and energy (and storage, if applicable). The total net costs are compared on a \$/kW basis, after application of the capacity contribution.
15	3/18/2020	3/25/2020	Geography	Would PacifiCorp consider expanding the screening stage to include 300% of interconnection capacity at a given location? Allowing more projects to be studied for the initial short list could help increase the competiveness of the RFP and provide some assurance that although there was extremely limited time to review the screening model, the RFP process accounted for the possibility of unidentified modeling issues by casting a wider net in the screening process.	The 150% is a guideline that PacifiCorp believes is sufficient because it will be 150% by resource type by location so in aggregate for a location, it could be greater than 150% depending on number of bids and bid capacity in that location. The company also recognizes that it may need to adjust the 150% level in consultation with the IEs to ensure there is a large enough pool of bids to choose from.
16	3/11/2020	4/17/2020	Geography	XYZ is preparing to participate in PACs forthcoming RFP. The 2019 IRP speaks to acquisition of MWs in "Southern Oregon". I'm wondering if there is a delineation of "South" in your system? Is there a geographic location which constitutes the southern portion of the OR system?	Southern Oregon topology does not distinguish any sub areas. It would generally be east of the cascades but excluding northeast Oregon. Any further questions can be directed to our 2020 all source RFP mailbox: RFPAllsource@pacificorp.com.

Q&A ID#	Date Q&A Submittted	Website Response Posting Date	Interpretted Primary Q&A Topic	Question	PacifiCorp Response
17	3/24/2020	4/17/2020	Geography	Can Pacificorp please refer to me a resource which would indicate the various POIs and/or transmission facilities which would fall under the various Pacificorp "load pockets" shown on slide 7 of the deck to be presented at tomorrow's Utah Pre-Issuance Bidders' Conference?? I'm trying to determine which load pockets our various projects would fall under. I imagine that general definitions of each of the load pockets would also suffice. I see reference to the load pockets in the IRP, but don't see more specific details that could help answer my questions.	PacifiCorp is currently working on a matrix that can be viewed in conjunction with the Location Capacity Limit map showing major substations by location "bubble". Bidders will need to determine how their project's location fits within that matrix.
18	3/25/2020	4/17/2020	Schedule	Considering stay-at-home orders and other disruptions due to the Covid-19 pandemic, it is difficult if not impossible to continue development of projects, which some are saying may extend for 18 months or more. We are concerned as well that there may be impacts to PacifiCorp's ability to administer the RFP in this environment. Is there a contingency plan or consideration of delay to the RFP because of Covid-19?	PacifiCorp has not considered delaying the RFP at this time due to Covid-19. PacifiCorp continues to monitor the situation and is following all required orders and precautions for its employees, customers and stakeholders in this and all other business processes.
19	3/25/2020	4/17/2020	Interconnection	The current RFP schedule only provides one day between PacfiCorp notifying bidders selected to Initial Shortlist (ISL) and the bidders required to notify PacfiCorp Transmission that they have satisfied the 'commercial readiness' requirements to enter the Transition Cluster. This does not appear to be a reasonable amount of time to ensure shortlisted projects are entered to the Transition Cluster and studied properly. Can that deadline be extended? Alternately, can an exception be written into the RFP that allows projects studied under the April 2021 Cluster Study to also be eligible for the RFP?	As proposed in PacifiCorp Transmission's queue reform filing at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, PacifiCorp's current deadline for notification by interconnection customers to participate in the October 2020 transition cluster study is October 15, 2020. PacifiCorp's RFP schedule was developed to ensure bidders selected to the initial shortlist have the ability to notify PacifiCorp Transmission on or before October 15, 2020 that they have met the commercial readiness criteria. Should the October 15, 2020 date be changed by PacifiCorp's RFP will adjust accordingly. PacifiCorp will not accept projects studied in the April 2021 cluster study in its 2020AS RFP.
20	3/25/2020	4/17/2020	Interconnection	FERC raised the issue of a delay in the RFP impacting the Transition Cluster timing in its review of Pacificor Transmission's queue reform request. PacifiCorp Transmission responded that it will try to accommodate delays but will not allow the Transition Cluster Readiness Deadline to extend past October 31, 2020. In the event that the RFP ISL notification does not allow reasonable time to demonstrate commercial readiness and thus enter the Transition Cluster, will PacifiCorp allow shortlisted projects to be studied in the April 2021 Cluster Study?	Should the October 15, 2020 date be changed by PacifiCorp Transmission as part of the interconnection queue reform process to a date no later than October 31, 2020, PacifiCorp's RFP will adjust accordingly. PacifiCorp's will not accept projects studied in the April 2021 cluster study in its 2020AS RFP.
21	3/25/2020	4/17/2020	Other	Similar to the wind PTC extension through 2024, it seems more likely than ever given the state of the economy that the solar ITC may be extended through 2024. The Pre-Bidders Conference presentation mentions an in-service date of December 31, 2024; does this also apply to solar projects in anticipation of an extension, or does it only apply to wind projects?	The December 31, 2024 date applies to all bids with the exception of the limited long-lead time resources such as pumped storage hydro. Bidders are expected to manage the risk and timing of utilizing any tax credits in their bid submittals.
22	3/25/2020	4/17/2020	Resource Types	Are new gas-fired resources eligible to bid into the All-Source RFP?	Yes, subject to the bid being in compliance with the requirements of the 2020AS RFP.
23	3/25/2020	4/17/2020	Agreements / Contracting	Is the proposed form of PPA available for review? Is there a form of Battery Storage Agreement available for review?	The proposed forms of PPA were filed in the draft RFP in Utah on April 9, 2020 and Oregon April 10, 2020. Final agreements are planned for release in July 2020.
24	3/25/2020	4/17/2020	BESS	Will you be providing any specifications on how PacifiCorp would like the battery to operate so evaluations can be accurate?	Yes, the RFP will have technical specifications for battery storage and some guidelines for sizing and operations.
25	3/25/2020	4/17/2020	Resource Types	I have a question on pumped storage and what pro forma agreement such as a capacity contract/tolling arrangement we should be reviewing for non-price scoring around contract performance given unique nature of resource type, but some clarity here would be greatly appreciated.	The form of agreement for a pumped storage project will be highly negotiated, and therefore a form of agreement is not planned for issuance in the RFP. Bidders for pumped storage hydro projects should provide sufficient information that allows the company to evaluate the economic and commercial merits of the proposal consistent with the requirements of the RFP. Bidders for pumped storage projects should submit a proposed term sheet with their proposals and are not required to mark-up or comment on the forms of agreement included in the RFP.
26	3/25/2020	4/17/2020	Geography	A solar project we are developing will deliver the power to Four Corners substation in northwestern NM, and will interconnect to a PNM substation/transmission line in NM. Will this project be considered N. Utah bubble project for PacifiCorp 2020 RFP? What would be the minimum requirement for a project like this (that connects to a non-PAC transmission system)? Would evidence of an interconnection application with PNM, site control, and COD by Dec 2024 be sufficient?	Four Corner's substation is not part of PacifiCorp's system. Bidders will need to secure firm point-to-point transmission to PacifiCorp's system. PacifiCorp's 2020AS RFP is accepting new resources, proposed under a PPA transaction, capable of interconnecting with a third-party transmission system and using third-party firm transmission service to deliver to PacifiCorp's transmission system. The minimum eligibility requirements for off-system bidders include an unredacted interconnection system impact study with the third party transmission provider and documentation of the availability of, and request for, long-term, firm third-party transmission service from the resource's point of interconnection with the third party's system to a point of delivery on PacifiCorp's system that is acceptable to PacifiCorp, achievable by December 31, 2024.
27	3/25/2020	4/17/2020	Interconnection	What is the likelihood of extension of the deadline date of January 31, 2020, for having an accepted interconnection request.	PacifiCorp Transmission has not proposed to extend the January 31st date proposed in its queue reform filing with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. PacifiCorp Transmission is awaiting a decision by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on its propoal.
28	3/25/2020	4/17/2020	Interconnection	Regarding the PacifiCorp all source RFP currently being drafted, will applications for projects outside of PacifiCorp's interconnection system be accepted? For instance, if a project was already undergoing the interconnection process with a different entity, could said project bid into this RFP? If so, what specifically would be required regarding transmission if an applicant's project is outside PacifiCorp's system, and what would the deadlines be on these requirements?	Pacificorp's 2020AS RFP is accepting new resources, proposed under a PPA transaction, capable of interconnecting with a third-party transmission system and using third-party firm transmission service to deliver to Pacificorp's transmission system. The minimum eligibility requirements for off-system bidders include an unredacted interconnection system impact study with the third party transmission provider and documentation of the availability of, and request for, long-term, firm third-party transmission service from the resource's point of interconnection with the third party's system to a point of delivery on PacifiCorp's system that is acceptable to PacifiCorp, achievable by December 31, 2024.
29	3/26/2020	4/17/2020	Agreements / Contracting	Will the bid commitment structure follow the 2017RFP process where a commitment letter is required within 20 days of the initial short list selection, and bid security is required to be posted in favor of PacifiCorp within 5 days of PPA/BTA execution at a value of \$200/kW?	Yes, as currently proposed.
30	3/26/2020	4/17/2020	Agreements / Contracting	Will the bid commitment structure follow the 2017RFP process where a commitment letter is required within 20 days of the initial short list selection, and bid security is required to be posted in favor of PacifiCorp within 5 days of PPA/BTA execution at a value of \$200/kW?	This seems to be the same questions as above.
31	3/26/2020	4/17/2020	Other	Is there a bid penalty for withdrawing the bid submission at any time prior to final short list selection?	There is no penalty at the current time however your bid fee will not be returned.
32	3/26/2020	4/17/2020	Other	Does PacifCorp anticipate change of control provisions that are consistent with the 2017RFP process? Can PacifiCorp specifically highlight restrictions that will be in place during the shortlist, development, construction and operating phases	We expect that those provisions will be consistent with the 2017R RFP however they will continue to be reviewed during the draft RFP regulatory process.
33	3/26/2020	4/17/2020	Agreements / Contracting	of proponent projects? Are there material changes to the 2017RFP process or PPA that PacifiCorp can highlight for proponents?	While the forms of PPA are substantially similar to the forms included in prior RFPs, the forms of PPA have been updated both for substance and clarity. Terms have also been modified to reflect experience learned in recent PPA negotiations. We will also have a form of PPA that contemplates inclusion of batteries, which we haven't included in prior RFPs.

Q&A ID#	Date Q&A Submittted	Website Response Posting Date	Interpretted Primary Q&A Topic	Question	PacifiCorp Response
34	3/26/2020	4/17/2020	Agreements / Contracting	When will Gateway South (GWS) construction commence and be completed? When will this schedule be formally issued? Will the form of PPA contain adequate compensation for successful proponents, if the GWS is delayed or is not completed/cancelled?	The 2019 IRP projects a commercial operation date for Gateway South of 2023. The specifics of the construction schedule will depend on when PacifiCorp receives the necessary regulatory approvals. The forms of PPA will not include provisions specific to completion of GWS or any other transmission component associated with delivery of a proposed resource.
35	3/26/2020	4/17/2020	Other	Per the 2019 IRP, GWS is slated for an in-service date of December 2023. If an eastern WY project is ready for early construction and a COD by Dec 31,2023 (1 year prior to the RFP COD of Dec 31, 2024), will the PPA offer the flexibility to achieve an early COD? Will PacifiCorp Transmission be ready and available to offer an early interconnection date? This is desirable to mitigate the schedule risk of the 2024 60% PTC cliff and the short construction seasonality of eastern WY.	PacifiCorp will accept a project with a COD prior to December 31, 2024. Whether an interconnection service commercial operation date can be accelerated will depend heavily on whether the commercial operation dates of all of the contingent facilities and network upgrades required to provide the interconnection service have also been accelerated. Interconnection customers are always welcome to speak to PacifiCorp Transmission about the requirements of and specific circumstances associated with their interconnection agreement.
36	3/26/2020	4/17/2020	Interconnection	In the PacifiCorp queue reform FERC filling, Mr. Rick Vail's testimony dated January 31, 2020, stated that 1130MW of projects have signed interconnection agreements that are contingent upon GWS. As per FERC filling, these projects can continue proceeding forward under the existing serialized queue system. Firstly, does this mean that 1130MW of the 1920MW of capacity along GWS is pre-reserved regardless of project competitiveness in the 2020AS RFP? Please describe how projects with an executed interconnection agreement will be evaluated for the initial short-list selection? Please also clarify how a project without an executed LGIA would be considered more competitive than a project with an executed LGIA considering allocation of Network Upgrade direct and indirect costs. Secondly, does this imply that the remaining projects without an executed interconnection agreement in the eastern WY region are competing for the remaining 790MW of capacity and only the projects selected will enter into the GWS region transitional cluster study?	The initial shortlist is selected without regard to interconnection status (including whether a bidder has an executed interconnection agreement) or interconnection costs, with the caveat that the bid must have an accepted interconnection application as of January 31, 2020 per PacifiCorp Transmission's filed interconnection queue reform application. This means ALL bids, including those with executed LGIAs, must be competitive compared with all other bids in order to be selected to the initial shortlist. All bids that are selected to the initial shortlist will be notified of their selection, which meets the commercial readiness requirement to participate in the transition cluster study for those without late-stage interconnection studies or executed contracts. Bidders are responsible to notify PacifiCorp Transmission of their intent to participate in the transition cluster study. There will be no bias between a bid with an executed LGIA or one without. Both will have their interconnection costs determined at the end of the cluster study process, either those contained in their retained executed LGIA or those assigned via the transition cluster study.
37	3/26/2020	4/17/2020	Interconnection	If a GWS contingent project with an executed interconnection does not participate in the 2020AS RFP, is the initial short list capacity in the eastern WY region reduced down from 1920MW to the equivalent MW of the non-RFP participating project with an executed LGIA? For example, if Project A has an executed interconnection agreement for 200MW and is a GWS contingent project, does the volume of the initial short-listed projects reduced from 1920MW to 1720MW?	Yes, assuming no other changes, such as queue position withdrawal or executed contract termination.
38	3/26/2020	4/17/2020	Geography	Can PacifiCorp please elaborate why the initial short-listed capacity within the eastern WY region is capped at 1920 MW vs the 1.5x multiplier that applies to other regions? If the eastern WY capacity is limited to 1920MW, how will PacifiCorp address potential attrition of short-listed projects due to failed commercial negotiations or via a project fatal flaw analysis? As currently contemplated, project attrition may result in underutilized GWS capacity.	Please see Mr. Rick Vail's testimony dated January 31, 2020 in the PacifiCorp Transmission interconnection queue reform filing at FERC which covers the eastern Wyoming capacity limit – a limit that has been extensively studied as a result of it having been part of PacifiCorp's long-term transmission plan since approximately 2008. In addition, a review of PacifiCorp Transmission's posted interconnection queue on OASIS shows the number of resources in eastern Wyoming that could be eligible to be considered in the transition cluster study in that area. Other areas of the system are not similarly situated to the eastern Wyoming area insofar as their potential interconnection limitations and capabilities are based on the IRP's high-level estimates that that do not take into account the existing interconnection queue and/or executed interconnection agreements, and that need additional studying. If FERC approves PacifiCorp transmission's queue reform filing, additional study work will occur in the proposed transitional cluster study slated for October 2020, and the makeup of the existing interconnection queue and executed agreements will be more certain.
39	3/26/2020	4/17/2020	Interconnection	How will PacifiCorp treat/evaluate a project in the GWS region that have signed Interconnection Agreements but are not on the shortlist and therefore not part of the Cluster Study? And how long will interconnection/transmission capacity continue to be reserved for such projects?	PacifiCorp's RFP team will only evaluate projects that submit bids. PacifiCorp transmission will provide interconnection service in accordance with the terms of its executed interconnection agreements, including by setting aside Gateway South interconnection capacity in the Gateway South cluster study for any interconnection capacity in the Gateway South cluster study for any interconnection student of active agreement or late-stage interconnection study. With respect to how long the capacity will continue to be reserved for projects with executed interconnection agreements, the agreements allow, consistent with regulatory requirements, interconnection customers to delay their commercial operation dates by suspending service for up to three years. As noted above, however, PacifiCorp will not enter into a commercial arrangement with a resource during the upcoming 2020 RFP (or at any point in the future) simply because that resource has an executed interconnection contract. ALL bids must be competitive when compared with all other bids.
40	3/26/2020	4/17/2020	Interconnection	In the queue reform filing, it is suggested that projects with executed interconnection agreements can elect to either continue with serialized interconnection project or opt into the transitional cluster study. Can PacifiCorp please elaborate on the advantages / disadvantages of either approach? Secondly, If a project has an executed interconnection agreement and is selected in the initial short list, does the transitional cluster study fee of \$250,000 for projects greater than 200MW apply? This question assumes the preceding question is inaccurate and all projects regardless of interconnection status enter the transitional cluster study.	Based on the proposal contained in the queue reform filing, PacifiCorp transmission disagrees that the option described in your question is available to customers with executed interconnection agreements. It is, however, available for "late stage" pending interconnection requests – i.e., an Interconnection Customer that, as of April 1, 2020, is "at or beyond the point in the interconnection process when it has been tendered a Facilities Study Agreement but has not executed an LGIA or, as applicable, SGIA." Any interconnection customer in this position is welcome to reach out to PacifiCorp transmission to discuss its potential options.
41	3/26/2020	4/17/2020	Interconnection	Considering GWS was originally conceived as a PacifiCorp Transmission lead project where the costs were to be rate based and that executed interconnection agreements state the associated Network Upgrade costs associated with the interconnection (& exclude GWS costs), can PacifiCorp please confirm that GWS costs will in fact be rate based and will not be allocated to the GWS region transitional cluster study projects (ie the remaining 790MW)?	Yes.
42	3/26/2020	4/17/2020	Geography	Considering the rich wind resource area of eastern WY and the low cost of levelized power from the region, would PacifiCorp consider doubling the GWS capacity and twin the GWS conductors? Any incremental Network Upgrade costs of twinning the GWS lines could then be allocated to the transitional cluster study projects associated with the second set of lines, or rate based as Pacificorp sees fit.	Gateway South as a single circuit, 500 kV line has been in PacifiCorp's long-term transmission plan since approximately 2008, and it has no current plan to convert it to a double circuit line. That said, the transition cluster study and each subsequent prospective cluster study will identify any necessary network upgrades to provide interconnection service to the set of interconnection requests received for that cluster. PacifiCorp Transmission cannot speculate on the potential results, but acknowledges that there is a possibility that cluster study results in either the transition cluster or a future cluster may identify additional network upgrades beyond the current scope of Gateway South as being necessary to interconnect future incremental resources in eastern Wyoming.

Q&A ID#	Date Q&A Submittted	Website Response Posting Date	Interpretted Primary Q&A Topic	Question	PacifiCorp Response
43	3/26/2020	4/17/2020	Interconnection	It was stated on the March 18th RFP call, that the RFP bid submission must align with the interconnection applications. What does alignment imply? We are assuming this include the total project size in MW, interconnection voltage, point of interconnection location, NRI/ERI request, and site control land. Please confirm if this list fulfills the intent of this statement, and if there are any items beyond this list that are required to comply? Other items may include turbine technology selection & quantity, substation configuration, etc.	Generally, the list offered in this question covers the components PacifiCorp expects to be reviewing for consistency between the bid and interconnection documents. PacifiCorp would also look at the resource technology, particularly bids considering battery storage co-located with the resource. The purpose of this consistency check is to identify differences early in the bid evaluation process and assess whether those differences early in the bid evaluation process and assess whether those differences might trigger a rejection at the transition cluster study phase for failure to satisfy the commercial readiness criteria proposed in PacifiCorp transmission's queue reform filing. While PacifiCorp's RFP team will do its best to identify inconsistencies between the bid for a project and the interconnection documentation for a project, it is ultimately the responsibility of the bidder, not of PacifiCorp to ensure consistency across all aspects of those materials – even aspects not specifically listed in this question or in this response. Ultimately, even if PacifiCorp's RFP team does not identify an inconsistency of ridentifies an inconsistency but estimates that the inconsistency is unlikely to impact the bidder's ability to satisfy the commercial readiness requirements), that does not mean PacifiCorp transmission will agree with that determination. And PacifiCorp transmission alone will make the ultimate decision on whether an interconnection customer provides commercial readiness consistent with PacifiCorp transmission's proposed tariff requirements so it can be included in the transition cluster study. Any interconnection customer is welcome to reach out to PacifiCorp transmission to discuss this issue as applied to its specific interconnection requirements and documentation.
44	3/30/2020	4/17/2020	BESS	Would Rocky Mountain Power be interested in DC couple batteries? DC couple batteries have advantages in that they can capture clipped energy and they store energy more efficiently from the PV system as there are less losses. It is slightly more difficult to treat the battery and PV system as distinct resources.	PacifiCorp will accept conforming proposals for DC-coupled battery storage systems.
45	3/30/2020	4/17/2020	BESS	Is it RMP's preference that the battery and the PV system have their own interconnection capacity? Or in other words, would RMP expect the battery and PV system to export at full capacity at the same time. Or, is it acceptable that the PV system and the battery storage system share interconnection capacity?	PacifiCorp will review the total interconnection capacity of a bid proposal. Bidders should contact PacifiCorp Transmission to discuss interconnection requirements for batteries collocated with a solar resource to determine if a material modification of the interconnection request is necessary.
46	3/30/2020	4/17/2020	Interconnection	At the Utah Bidders conference, PacifiCorp noted that if FERC doesn't accept queue reform by the time the RFP is approved for issuance in July, it would change minimum requirements and bidders would not have to provide any other readiness evidence other than accepted interconnection request by Pac transmission. Can you clarify or outline what the minimum requirements and readiness criteria would be? Does this mean that the January 31, 2020 deadline would become irrelevant and any project with an accepted interconnection request that was/is accepted between now and July would qualify for the RFP?	If FERC does not approve PacifiCorp Transmission's interconnection queue reform application prior to the expected RFP release in early July, the January 31, 2020 deadline would be irrelevant and just having an accepted interconnection request would not be acceptable. PacifiCorp would require bidders to provide at bid submittal in August 2020, the minimum of an unredacted system impact study for the project showing costs and timing for direct interconnection and network upgrades associated with the interconnection.
47	3/31/2020	4/17/2020	Interconnection	I have a question for one of my clients around the interconnection request requirement. Is PacifiCorp willing to waive the requirement a project having an interconnection request filed by January 31st of this year in order to be a viable project?	No. The interconnection application request must be accepted by PacifiCorp Transmission before January 31, 2020 in order to be included in the transition cluster study in October 2020, as proposed in PacifiCorp Transmission's interconnection queue reform filing pending at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Should that date as part of PacifiCorp Transmission's interconnection queue reform be modified before the release of the 2020AS RFP in July 2020, PacifiCorp will modify its RFP accordingly.
48	3/31/2020	4/17/2020	Resource Types	Please see PacifiCorp's Oregon IE RFP at page 4. Please explain the basis for not allowing existing operating facilities to bid consistent with an "all-source" RFP.	The all-source RFP is seeking incremental new resources consistent with PacifiCorp's 2019 IRP.
49	3/31/2020	4/17/2020	Resource Types	Please see PacifiCorp PacifiCorp's Oregon IE RFP Attachment C at 2 in which PacifiCorp states it will not accommodate build-transfer transactions that involve the ultimate transfer of a project company to PacifiCorp. What kind of build transfer transactions will PacifiCorp accommodate, if not for project companies? Please list and describe in detail.	This RFP is for purchase of power or the asset, and not for the purchase of a development asset or a project company.
50	3/31/2020	4/17/2020	BESS	Please see PacifiCorp PacifiCorp's Oregon IE RFP Attachment C at 2. What terms and conditions will the separate BESS agreement contain?	The battery storage agreement (BSA) will be a termsheet with the major terms and conditions of a transaction including among others operating and dispatch protocol, price, performance measures, defaults and damages. PacifiCorp expects that the final agreement would be a highly negotiated agreement between PacifiCorp and the bidder.
51	3/31/2020	4/17/2020	BESS	Please see PacifiCorp PacifiCorp's Oregon IE RFP Attachment C at 2. For a separate BESS agreement, how are the terms for payments structured, especially with respect to capacity or availability?	The payment terms would be dependent on the actual bid however PacifCorp anticipates that the BSA would have a capacity payment that reflects the dispatch rights and conditions. PacifiCorp expects that the final agreement would be a highly negotiated agreement between PacifiCorp and the bidder.
52	3/31/2020	4/17/2020	Resource Types	Please see PacifiCorp PacifiCorp's Oregon IE RFP Attachment C at 3. Please provide a list of the specific utility property and right-of-way easements that PacifiCorp will make available to bidders.	The paragraph containing this wording was a drafting error and will be removed.
53	3/31/2020	4/17/2020	Interconnection	Please see PacifiCorp PacifiCorp's Oregon IE RFP Attachment C at 4. Please confirm that PacifiCorp Transmission is not actively studying new interconnection requests. If that is true, please explain why new interconnection requests need to be submitted by January 31 to be eligible to bid? Please consider the following related to the foregoing Question #6 and provide us with your response: Would you consider a later cutoff date, closer to the time when the interconnection study request will need to align with the bid review process, such as April 15, 2020, or even August 15, 2020? Your requirements for commercial readiness should reduce the potential study requests to a manageable number and size for completion of the necessary modeling of bids.	PacifiCorp merchant cannot speak for PacifiCorp Transmission's current status on interconnection requests. PacifiCorp merchant is intending to align its RFP process with PacifiCorp Transmission's proposed interconnection queue reform process filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, including their cutoff date for interconnection requests eligible for the transition cluster study. Should the January 31, 2020 date proposed in PacifiCorp Transmission's interconnection queue reform proposal change prior to release of the RFP, PacifiCorp will modify its RFP accordingly.
54	3/31/2020	4/17/2020	Interconnection	Please identify what transmission costs should be included in bids.	PacifiCorp is not requiring interconnection costs in bid submittals. However, there are interconnection minimum requirements demonstrating status of interconnection requests as well as third party interconnection and transmssion service status documentation.
55	3/31/2020	4/17/2020	BESS	Please see PacifiCorp PacifiCorp's Oregon IE RFP Attachment C, at note 25. Please explain why BESS capacity is limited to 25% of the nameplate capacity of co-located generation facilities. Please provide any studies which confirm the purpose of this limitation on BESS capacity for each project.	The 25% capacity is a minimum cpapcity requirement consistent with the 2019 IRP. PacifiCorp's RFP will have the 25% minimum but allow larger battery storage capacities.
56	3/31/2020	4/17/2020	BESS	Please explain what limits, if any, apply to BESS capacity for stand-alone storage projects.	There are no MW limits for standalone battery storage bids other than meeting any bidding requirements in the RFP.

Q&A ID#	Date Q&A Submittted	Website Response Posting Date	Interpretted Primary Q&A Topic	Question	PacifiCorp Response
57	3/31/2020	4/17/2020	Geography	Please explain what "accounting for the costs and benefits of each bid, and the cost and benefits of the Energy Gateway South transmission line" means in the following sentence: "Consistent with the 2019 IRP, PacifiCorp's model will be configured such that it can choose to select bids in eastern Wyoming recognizing that those selections would require the addition of Energy Gateway South while accounting for the cost and benefits of each individual bid, and the cost and benefits of the Energy Gateway South transmission line that is necessary to enable the interconnection of those bids."	Each bid will have associated costs as well as credits, such as an operating reserve credit. The optimal usage of Energy Gateway South may allow non-bid resources to avoid curtailments during some hours. In addition to bid costs, these types of offsetting benefits are simultaneously considered in the model's evaluation of which bids generate the greatest system benefits.
58	3/31/2020	4/17/2020	Price Score	Please see PacifiCorp PacifiCorp's Oregon IE RFP Attachment C at 5. Please provide examples of how marginal system energy value and marginal operating reserve value will be calculated by the PAR modeling for all the resource types eligible to bid.	The PAR model is both licensed and proprietary. A detailed workbook or work paper that represents this calculation from PAR is unavailable. The reference in the Oregon IE RFP presentation was meant to describe the optimization that will be performed by PAR, and how the results will be translated into a \$/kW-YR.
59	3/31/2020	4/17/2020	Other	Please see PacifiCorp PacifiCorp's Oregon IE RFP Attachment C at 6. Please explain what resource performance data will be required to bid.	The 2020AS RFP spells out the energy performance requirements by resource type. This is generally a third-party report provided by the bidder substantiating the resource's performance over the term of the proposed agreement.
60	3/31/2020	4/17/2020	Schedule	Please describe in detail any material modification analysis and parameters you will apply ito any variation in size and project specifics, between an interconnection study request in the queue as of January 31, 2020, April 15, 2020, and August 15, 2020 (as example dates), as compared to the size and terms of the bid submitted into the RFP.	PacifiCorp will review each submitted bid to confirm that the proposed resource capacity and other metrics such as location, point of interconnection, and resource type are consistent with its interconnection materials. Any "material modification analysis" associated with an interconnection submittal should be discussed with PacifiCorp Transmission.
61	4/1/2020	4/17/2020	Off-System	During the pre-issuance bidder's conference, it was mentioned that off-system projects would need to meet two conditions: 1) In-Service Date of 12/2024, 2) Proof of Transmission Service Availability. Regarding the second point, what are the specific criteria to show the project has available transfer capacity to deliver to PAC's system and be considered as a conforming bid?	The requirements for an off-system resource are as follows: The minimum eligibility requirements for off-system bidders include an unredacted interconnection system impact study with the third party transmission provider and documentation of the availability of, and request for, long-term, firm third-party transmission service from the resource's point of interconnection with the third party's system to a point of delivery on PacificOrp's system that is acceptable to PacifiCorp, achievable by December 31, 2024. Transmission service documentation to PacifiCorp's system is two-fold; firm capacity is available on third-party transmission provider and bidder has made a request to the third-party transmission provider and bidder has made a request to service to PacifiCorp's system.
62	4/1/2020	4/17/2020	Interconnection	We note that the January 31, 2020 proposed interconnection deadline is 6 months prior to the release of the issuance of the RFP proposed to occur on July 6, 2020. This deadline preceded the March 25, 2020 Pre-issuance Bidder's Conference associated with the opportunity. Will a bid be considered conforming despite not having an interconnection application submitted prior to the proposed January 31, 2020 deadline for the transition cluster study?	No. In compliance with PacifiCorp Transmission's proposed queue reform as filed with FERC on January 31, 2020, the interconnection application request must be accepted by PacifiCorp Transmission as of January 31, 2020 in order to be included in the transition cluster study in October 2020. Should that date as part of PacifiCorp Transmission's interconnection queue reform be modified before the release of the 2020AS RFP in July 2020, PacifiCorp will modify its
63	4/1/2020	4/17/2020	Resource Types	Bids from pumped storage hydro and nuclear resources, technologies requiring greater lead times, will be accepted if their scheduled completion is beyond December 31, 2024. Other technologies, like compressed air energy storage (CAES) also require greater lead times. To avoid potentially excluding CAES from the RFP, will PacifiCorp grant this resource a commercial deadline beyond December 31, 2024?	RFP to reflect that. Presently, PacifiCorp's 2020AS RFP assumes PacifiCorp Transmission's proposed interconnection queue reforms filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission will be approved before the release of the RFP to the market in July. Under PacifiCorp Transmission's proposed interconnection queue reform proposal, projects that haven't submitted an interconnection request by January 31, 2020 are deemed ineligible for participation in the transitional cluster study. Accordingly, after January 31, 2020, PacifiCorp reviewed PacifiCorp Transmission's public OASIS application queue and only identified long lead time pumped storage and nuclear resource interconnection applications. No CAES projects were identified. Should that date as part of PacifiCorp Transmission's interconnection queue reform be modified before the release of the 2020AS RFP in July 2020, PacifiCorp will modify its RFP accordingly and reconsider the eligibility of CAES projects.
64	4/1/2020	4/17/2020	Resource Types	Can resources with commercial deadlines beyond December 31, 2024 (specifically pumped hydro, nuclear and CAES) receive an extended interconnection deadline (from the proposed January 31, 2020) to reflect the longer lead time these technologies require? For example, we would respectfully suggest establishing the interconnection requirement with the date of the RFP release or the date that the bids are due.	Presently, PacifiCorp's 2020AS RFP assumes PacifiCorp Transmission's proposed interconnection queue reforms filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission will be approved before the release of the RFP to the market in July. Under PacifiCorp Transmission's proposed interconnection queue reform proposal, projects that haven't submitted an interconnection request by January 31, 2020 are deemed ineligible for participation in the transitional cluster study. Accordingly, after January 31, 2020, PacifiCorp reviewed PacifiCorp Transmission's public OASIS application queue and only identified long lead time pumped storage and nuclear resource interconnection applications. Should that date as part of PacifiCorp Transmission's interconnection queue reform be modified before the release of the 2020AS RFP in July 2020, PacifiCorp will modify its RFP accordingly.
65	4/1/2020	4/17/2020	Interconnection	In the event that the FERC ruling on the proposed tariff is delayed, will the January 31, 2020 deadline for an interconnection application be a condition required for bid conformance in the 2020AS RFP? Would PacificOrp consider extending the date of this requirement? Again, we would respectfully suggest an alternative later date for the purposes of compliance with the RFP. We note that the webinar presentation states "RFP eligibility requirements or evaluation criteria will be revised as necessary to align with the final version of interconnection queue reform as approved by FERC before the RFP is issued to the market. If not approved by the time the RFP is approved for issuance, the RFP will be revised to be consistent with the current interconnection queue process as described in PacifiCorp Transmission's OATT."	Specific to interconnection queue reform, PacifiCorp will align its RFP schedule and milestones with a final FERC order. If FERC does not approve the interconnection queue reform application prior to the expected RFP release, the January 31, 2020 deadline would be irrelevant and just having an accepted interconnection request would not be acceptable. In that circumstance, PacifiCorp would require bidders to provide at bid submittal in August 2020, the minimum of an unredacted system impact study for the project showing costs and timing for direct interconnection and network upgrades associated with the interconnection.
66	4/1/2020	4/17/2020	Interconnection	Would PacifiCorp be open to a process where bidders accept the risk associated with the final interconnection costs associated with their bids into the RFP (i.e. they haven't submitted by January 31, 2020 and are not in the transitional cluster)? We note that the Phase I process will not have carity as to the interconnection costs anyways (therefore bidders may be short-listed on the basis of incomplete information and the transmission costs will not be known until Phase III bidding in April of 2021 as we understand it).	No. The RFP is to proceed in compliance with PacifiCorp Transmission's interconnection study process at the time of the RFP is issued. As currently proposed, the RFP is modeled assuming PacifiCorp Transmission's proposed interconnection queue reform proposals are adopted by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. As such, the RFP states that bidders are required to provide PacifiCorp evidence that they have an accepted interconnection request submitted with PacifiCorp Transmission by January 31, 2020.
67	4/1/2020	4/17/2020	Price Score	With reference to the Non-Price Scoring matrix's Project Readiness and Deliverability Criteria, could you please confirm that standalone energy projects that do not qualify for Federal Tax Credits will not be penalized for failing to provide documentation related to tax credit eligibility such as the "documentation of safe harbor equipment"?	To the extent any bidder is confirming no claim(s) or assumption(s) of any federal tax credits in association with their bid, such bid will not be penalized in this section of Non-Price Scoring.
68	4/1/2020	4/17/2020	Resource Types	Will PacifiCorp consider non-conforming bids that may be superior in terms of providing system and ratepayer value?	If proposals do not comply with the RFP requirements and is deemed non- conforming, PacifiCorp in consultation with the IE, reserves the option to eliminate such proposal from further evaluation in the RFP.

Q&A ID#	Date Q&A Submittted	Website Response Posting Date	Interpretted Primary Q&A Topic	Question	PacifiCorp Response
69	4/7/2020	4/17/2020	Other	I would like to understand if there is the potential that PacifiCorp could divide the 2020 All Source RFP into separate jurisdictional (state) RFPs, subject to their own set of bidders rules? For example, if the Oregon PUC required certain conditions of the RFP, would these be applied through the entire RFP, or be specific to energy procured in the state of Oregon?	This proposed approach is not being considered. The 2020 all source RFP is intended to comply with commission rules from each of our states.
70	4/8/2020	4/17/2020	Resource Types	From the web meeting a few weeks ago, wanted to ensure that legacy projects are included in this rfp. Are existing projects allowed to bid or is this all new construction?	PacifiCorp will not accept bids in the 2020AS RFP from existing operating facilities.
71	4/9/2020	4/17/2020	Interconnection	I wanted to follow up regarding the requirement that all projects participating in PacifiCorp's 2020 All-Source RFP are required to have filed an interconnection request by Jan 31. As PacifiCorp moves to respond to FERC's Deficiency Letter, we wanted to ask whether PacifiCorp would be willing to remove the Jan 31 deadline and/or replace it with a later date for example, the date the final RFP is issued would make sense. We believe PacifiCorp's overall approach to queue reform is sound. We are just asking that the cutoff deadline for projects that can participate in the RFP and transition cluster study be moved forward and/or eliminated.	PacifiCorp's RFP has been drafted to align with milestone dates established by PacifiCorp Transmission in their application which is pending FERC approval. Should milestone dates change as a result of an order from FERC prior to release of the RFP to market, PacifiCorp will make adjustments in its RFP reflecting the change. Should interconnection queue reform not be approved by FERC prior to release of the RFP, PacifiCorp's RFP will be modified to reflect a serial queue interconnection process as provided in PacifiCorp Transmission's OATT.
72	4/9/2020	4/17/2020	Interconnection	Assuming that a project can satisfy any requirements that the RFP will have with respect to the date on which the project entered Pacificorp's interconnection queue, will Pacificorp be accepting proposals from projects that are in the interconnection queue as a qualifying facility?	Yes. Projects certified or self-certified as qualifying facilities (QFs) under the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act are eligible to bid in the RFP, subject to all requirements of the RFP. However, any QF project that intends to sell power to the utility under the "must purchase" provisions of PURPA (and implementing state laws), should not bid in this RFP and should comply with the applicable requirements of applicable state law and the company's implementing QF schedules.
73	4/13/2020	4/17/2020	Schedule	I have yet to be able to access the draft RFP. Is it available?	A draft was filed in Utah docket 20-035-05, and posted on commission website on April 9th. A draft was posted in Oregon UM 2059 docket on April 10th.
74	4/13/2020	4/17/2020	Contracting	In draft RFP statement and referring to pump storage hydro (PSH), "Due to the unique operating characteristics of a PSH, PacifiCorp has not included a pro-forma PSH agreement, rather the PSH will be an individually negotiated agreement." Question - Without a pro-formal agreement that we would prefer to see, at least a shell of/high-level framework, any clarity on what we should be bidding in as it relates to a tolling agreement?	The form of agreement for a pumped storage project will be highly negotiated, and therefore a form of agreement is not planned for issuance in the RFP. Bidders for pumped storage hydro projects should provide sufficient information that allows the company to evaluate the economic and commercial merits of the proposal consistent with the requirements of the RFP. Bidders for pumped storage projects should submit a proposed term sheet with their proposals and are not required to mark-up or comment on the forms of agreement included in the RFP.
75	4/13/2020	4/27/2020	Interconnection	Can you confirm that the interconnection cluster study to be performed by Pac- Trans for the projects making the initial shortlist will assume that each project is declared a network resource (i.e., rather than an energy-only resource)? I am trying to confirm that Pacificorp will be evaluating the full deliverable interconnection cost of each shortlisted project.	PacifiCorp transmission will study each generator interconnection consistent with the details of the generator's interconnection request.
76	4/13/2020	4/27/2020	Geography	Based on my read of the draft RFP filed with the Utah PSC: 1. Each project will receive a relative price score (0 to 75) based on its bid costs net of the associated system-value as determined by the PaR model. (Page 27 of RFP, second and third paragraphs), 2. The price score will be added to the non-price score (0 to 25) to arrive at a total score (0 to 100). Pacifictory will use the combined score to rank bids (page 28 of draft RFP, paragraph immediately below table), 3. "Pacificorp will identify an initial pool of resources by location and resource type based on the total bid score This initial pool of resources will be made available as resource alternatives for IRP modeling". (page 28 of draft RFP, paragraph immediately below table), and 4. "Upon identification of the initial pool of bids, bid inputs will be submitted to the IRP team for modeling of the resources using the production cost models will select the optimized portfolio of resources subject to the same total capacity limits used to score and rank bids in the initial pool of resources. As noted above, PacifiCorp will limit the capacity in a given location to 150% of the capacity included in the Company's 2019 IRP preferred portfolio." (page 28 of draft RFP, first paragraph of Section 3). My question are: 1. How many bids/how much capacity will be included in the "initial pool of resources" (3 above) subject to the production cost model used in the 2019 IRP (4 above)? Presumably the capacity of the initial pool of resources must exceed 150% of the capacity included in the company's 2019 IRP preferred portfolio. 2. Will the total price + non-price score (2 above) be used in the production cost model described in step 4 above? Or are those scores only used to determine the "initial pool of resources" and then subsequently disregarded?	The initial pool of resources by location and resource type will be a function of the eligible bids received at each location. At each location, the screening model will review and evaluate every bid submitted, and calculate a price score to which the non-price score will be added. The top bids representing 150% of the locational maximum generation by resource type will be submitted to PacifiCorp's Integrated Resource Planning for modeling to determine the initial short list. The initial short list will be limited to ~150% of the stated location maximum generation, without regard to generation type. Therefore, the price and non-price scoring process is unique to the screening stage of this process.
77	4/14/2020	4/27/2020	Agreements / Contracting	What is the required credit support/security for pumped storage? It isn't abundantly clear reading Appendix D?	Please see page 3 and 4 of Appendix D. For a PPA, development security is \$200/kWthrough COD then dropping to \$100/kW for term. For a BTA, development security is \$200/kW up to COD/closing. The RFP speaks in terms of December 31, 2024 as it is the default COD. FOr pump storage, it will be the COD as determined by the developer.
78	4/14/2020	4/27/2020	Agreements / Contracting	On Equipment Supply Matrix (attached), do you want us to create a tab for hydro or is this something PAC can provide as a template?	The forms and appendices in the draft 2020 all-source RFP do not cover all resource types. Bidders should fill-in as much of the Equipment Supply Matrix as possible and add additional rows or a new tab to provide any other equipment information pertaining to the specific resource type being submitted.
79	4/15/2020	4/27/2020	Agreements / Contracting	May wind projects propose a COD earlier than 12/31/2024? May solar projects?	Yes.
80	4/15/2020	4/27/2020	Interconnection	What is the current timing of the Gateway South transmission line? When will you file the CPCNs?	The 2019 IRP targets a commercial operation date for Gateway South of 2023. PacifiCorp is tentatively planning on making the required CPCN filings in Q2 or Q3 2020.
81	4/15/2020	4/27/2020	Interconnection	What is the current in-service date? Does the PTC extend the in-service date?	PacifiCorp assumes this relates to the in-service date of the Gateway South transmission line. The 2019 IRP projects a commercial operation date for Gateway Southof 2023. The availability or expiration of federal investment or production tax credits has not factored into PacifiCorp's estimated in-service date for this component of the company's long-term transmission plan.
82	4/15/2020	4/27/2020	Resource Types	Does expansion of an existing operating resource count as "green-field"?	Yes, if existing operating resource is owned by the bidder.
83	4/15/2020	4/27/2020	Resource Types	Will PAC accept a bid for a new BESS collocated with an existing generating facility?	Yes, provided the new BESS can satisfy all the requirements for eligibility in the RFP, including conforming interconnection arrangements.
84	4/15/2020	4/27/2020	Resource Types	The RFP page 4 says 25% is a "minimum" percentage of co-located renewable resource installed capacity, is that correct? Our previous understanding was that 25% was the maximum.	The "minimum" installed capacity for a battery which is co-located with a renewable resource is 25%.
85	4/15/2020	4/27/2020	Resource Types	Will PAC accept combined PPA/BTA proposals for solar projects such that one could not be selected without the other? And would such combined proposal can be contracted for under one single, combined agreement?	Yes. Such a combined proposal, if selected, would ultimately be contracted under two separate agreements, one for the PPA and the other for the BTA.
•		•	*	_ ` ` ` `	

Q&A ID#	Date Q&A Submittted	Website Response Posting Date	Interpretted Primary Q&A Topic	Question	PacifiCorp Response
86	4/15/2020	4/27/2020	Interconnection	What is considered satisfactory evidence that interconnection or transmission service on a third-party's system is "readily obtainable"?	The minimum eligibility requirements for off-system bidders include an unredacted interconnection system impact study with the third party transmission provider and documentation of the availability of, and request for, long-term, firm third-party transmission service from the resource's point of interconnection with the third party's system to a point of delivery on PacifiCorp's system that is acceptable to PacifiCorp.
87	4/15/2020	4/27/2020	Interconnection	Will the interconnection or transmission service costs associated with a project on a third-party's system be considered when PAC creates its shortlist, even though these costs are not considered when evaluating projects on PAC's system?	Bidders proposing a resource that interconnects to a third-party transmission system are responsible for all interconnection costs and transmission charges required to deliver the output (on a firm basis) to the identified point of delivery on PacifiCorp's system that is acceptable to PacifiCorp. These costs will not be included in the evaluation of PPA proposals as they will be the responsibility of the bidder, if selected.
88	4/15/2020	4/27/2020	Agreements / Contracting	What documentation of site control is acceptable? (e.g. MOU, LOI, Lease, Easement, Option, etc.)	Documentation demonstrating reasonable evidence of site control includes real property leases, easements or binding option agreements. The terms of a letter of intent will be reviewed to determine whether it demonstrates a clear, unconditioned right to acquire the property associated with a bid resource, consistent with the terms of the bid. If a submitted LOI is deemed too conditional in nature, it will be rejected, in PacifiCorp's reasonable determination.
89	4/15/2020	4/27/2020	Interconnection	Can a project be bid with less nameplate capacity than the associated interconnection request, if the interconnection rules allow the request to be downsized in the interconnection process?	If the interconnection customer has confirmed with PacifiCorp's transmission function that reducing the size of the interconnection request will not trigger a Material Modification under the OAT rules, then yes. It would be best to secure this confirmation from PacifiCorp's transmission function before the bid is submitted. PacifiCorp's bid evaluation team reserves the right to request further information from the bidder to evaluate whether such bid project (if smaller than the proposed project identified in the associated interconnection materials) compromises the viability of the bidder's eligibility for PacifiCorp Transmission's transitional interconnection cluster study process (assuming PacifiCorp Transmission's interconnection queue reform proposal is approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and such project is selected for this RFP's initial shortlist) or otherwise results in the interconnection application not reasonably supporting the commercial operation date or other key components proposed in the bid. Please refer also to PacifiCorp's response to Question 43 above.
90	4/15/2020	4/27/2020	Price Score	Please provide the actual values for "internal assumptions for key financial inputs (i.e. inflation, discount rates, marginal tax rates, asset lives, AFUDC rates, etc.) and PacifiCorp carrying costs (i.e., integration costs, owner's costs, etc.)" as referenced in the draft RFP page 27	Due to the voluatility of certain of these assumptions over time, the input values requested will be posted in the June/July timeframe (closer to the final RFP's release).
91	4/15/2020	4/27/2020	Agreements / Contracting	Is an independent third party engineering firm's forecasted energy performance analysis required for bids of all types of resources or just wind?	Both wind and solar renewable bids (offered as either PPAs and BTAs) will require an independent third party assessment, satisfactory to PacificOrp, validating resource estimates (see 2020AS RFP Section 5B). For bids chosen for the Initial Shortlist, PacifiCorp will be engaging its own independent third party to review and evaluate all wind and solar resource estimates.
92	4/15/2020	4/27/2020	Agreements / Contracting	Are two years of on-site meteorological tower data required for solar BTA bids?	For solar BTA bids, PacifiCorp will require bidder provide at least one year of on-site collected solar resource data as part of the bidder's solar resource performance-estimates described in Section 5B. SEE RESPONSE TO Q&A# 114.
93	4/15/2020	4/27/2020	Agreements / Contracting	Is one year of on-site meteorological tower data required for solar PPA bids?	For a solar PPA bid, PacifiCorp will not require bidder provide to provide on site-collected solar-resource data as part of the bidder's solar-resource performance-estimates described in Section 5B However, as described in the RFP, bidder will-be required to provide a solar-resources estimate based on TMY data (listing-specific TMY-points used and solar-resource time duration data) for purposes of determining the asset's long term-solar-resource. SEE RESPONSE TO Q&A# 114.
94	4/16/2020	4/27/2020	Price Score	Noting that IEs are working for Utah and Oregon PUCs, how will proposed generation interconnecting to PacifiCorp's system but based in Idaho be evaluated?	Each bid will be evaluated based on its estimated system benefits, as a system resource, regardless of the state in which the resource is interconnected, or how the resource is otherwise delivered to PacifiCorp's system.
95	4/16/2020	4/27/2020	Agreements / Contracting	Appendix C-3 of the draft RFP filed with Utah commission states that • All BTA bid submittals must include a minimum of two years of on-site meteorological tower data, converted to an estimated MWh of production on an hourly time scale. • PPA bid submittals must include a minimum of one year of on-site meteorological tower data, converted to an estimated MWh production on an hourly time scale. Can you please confirm whether on-site resource data is required for solar projects? The term "meteorological tower" suggests that these requirements are applicable to wind energy projects.	For solar BTA bids, PacifiCorp will require bidder provide at least one year of on-site collected solar resource data as part of the bidder's solar resource performance estimates described in Section 5B. For a solar PPA bid, PacifiCorp will not require bidder provide to provide on-site collected solar resource data as part of the bidder's solar resource performance estimates described in Section 5B However, as described in the RFP, bidder will be required to provide a solar resource estimate-based on TMY-data (listing specific TMY points used and solar resource time duration data) for purposes of determining the asset's long term-solar resource.— SEE RESPONSE TO Q&A# 114.
96	4/17/2020	4/27/2020	Agreements / Contracting	There was mention on workshop call that you don't have a PSH toll agreement yet but are working on it which we'd be very interested to review. However, it was also mentioned that the battery PPA agreement gives a good indication of what to expect. Reviewing this form, the storage price is expressed in \$MMV. Accordingly, we are seeking claffication that for PSH toll you'd be looking for a capacity payment in \$/kw-month? Please advise.	We are currently developing an internal financial screening model for PSH. We currenly anticipate PSH bids to be structured as a toll that would include a capacity payment in \$/kw-month coupled with other variable operating charges.
97	4/17/2020	4/27/2020	Resource Types	Noting that the draft RFP indicates that PAC will not accept bids from existing operating facilities. Will PAC consider bids for repowerings of existing operating facilities?	No, this RFP is for new greenfield resources only.
98	4/17/2020	4/27/2020	Resource Types	Will PAC consider bids for resources connecting to the Colstrip Transmission System? If yes, would PAC evaluate such a bid assuming the use of PAC's existing transmission rights on CTS to deliver facility output to PAC's system?	Yes, given the minimum eligibility requirements as set forth in the RFP are met. "No" is response to second sentence question.
99	4/17/2020	4/27/2020	Interconnection	If a bidder plans to submit two base bids, one for stand-alone solar and one for solar co-located with BESS, and the two base bids reference the same project with the same point of interconnection, is a single underlying interconnection request acceptable for both base bids to meet the RFP's Bid-Interconnection Request consistency requirements? Or would two underlying interconnection requests be required – one for solar, and one for solar co-located with BESS?	WHILE IT WILL DEPEND ON THE SPECIFIC DETAILS OF THE TWO BASE BIDS DESCRIBED IN YOUR EXAMPLE, Using a single interconnection request to support two different bids would VERY LIKELY mean non-alignment for one of the bids with such single interconnection request. As discussed in the RFP, where there is non-alignment between a bidder's bid and the interconnection materials submitted in association with the bid, PacifiCory's bid evaluation team reserves the right to request further information from the bidder to evaluate whether its bid compromises bidder's eligibility for PacifiCorp Transmission's transitional interconnection cluster study process (assuming PacifiCorp Transmission's interconnection queue reform proposal is approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and such project is selected for this RFP's initial shortlist) or otherwise results in the interconnection application not reasonably supporting the commercial operation date or other key components proposed in the bid. Please refer also to PacifiCorp's response to Question 43 above.

Q&A ID#	Date Q&A Submittted	Website Response Posting Date	Interpretted Primary Q&A Topic	Question	PacifiCorp Response
100	4/21/2020	4/27/2020	Other	My client, that is a geothermal developer, will not be eligible to bid into the upcoming RFP. However, we are trying to determine the optimal pricing mechanism for future opportunities. For a geothermal plant, that essentially provides 24/7 power, would RMP be interested in a capacity contract, or folling arrangement? If for capacity, what is the current need for capacity for RMP?	PacifiCorp is not able at this time to respond to questions unrelated to this RFP. PacifiCorp refers the questioner generally to PacifiCorp's 2019 IRP.
101	4/22/2020	5/12/2020	Agreements / Contracting	Reviewing BESS PPA, curious when Exhibit K will be provided in reviewing this agreement as a proxy for a pumped storage tolling agreement.	PacifiCorp has provided a standalone BESS termsheet that would be more applicable to a pumped storage hydro project.
102	4/22/2020	5/12/2020	Agreements / Contracting	Is the tolling agreement term sheet provided previously in PacifiCorp's 2019C RFP a good template for a draft pumped storage tolling agreement, to help with preferred structuring?	The tolling agreement in the 2019C RFP is an example of a tolling agreement that would be done under either an ISDA Master Agreement with Power Annex on PacifiCorp's standard terms as mutually agreed or EEI Master Power Purchase & Sale Agreement on PacifiCorp's standard terms as mutually agreed. A bidder is free to refer to that prior form but should also review the enclosed standalone BESS termsheet included in this RFP.
103	4/23/2020	5/12/2020	Interconnection	Timelines on Gateway South is an important element in capital timing, financing, IDC, equipment, commodities and material escalation rates impacting RFP bid pricing. Can PacifiCorp provide a Gateway south regulatory and construction schedule to provide visibility into the current project status?	Please see responses to Q&A ID#s 34, 80 and 81.
104	4/23/2020	5/12/2020	Geography	Can you confirm PacifiCorp's treatment of Locational Capacity Limits? For example, is the maximum amount of resources that PacifiCorp will accept in PDX/Coast 130MW (se. 195/1.5)? Will a bid in excess of 130MW (or 195MW) be deemed non-compliant?	The map on the left in Appendix H of the RFP shows the preferred portfolio topology with locational "bubbles" where the IRP models selected resources accounting for expected transmission upgrades in those areas. The map on the right in Appendix H shows the 150% capacity targets proposed for those same bubbles in the RFP for its initial shortlist selection. As has been done in the prior RFPs, PacifiCorp scores and ranks a pool of resources greater than its need for selection to the initial shortlist selection. As has been considered that its need for selection to the initial shortlist. For this RFP, PacifiCorp is proposing 150% of the preferred portfolio in each locational bubble but also incorporating the diversity of the resource type, meaning PacifiCorp will score and rank bids by resource type up to 150% in each bubble. For example in southern Oregon, the 150% target is 750 MW, so PacifiCorp will score and rank a solar-only pool up to 750 MW, wind-only pool up to 750 MW, solar with battery pool up to 750 MW, etc., depending on the bids in that locational "bubble." These pools in aggregate for each locational bubble are expected to exceed the 150% limit. From these pools, the IRP model will select the initial shortlist made up of the optimum mix of resources at the 150% target. For your example, the Locational Capacity Limit for PDX/Coast is 195 MW even though it was not an area picked in the 2019 IRP preferred protfolio based on expected network upgrades during the RFP on-line horizon. In this case the 195 MW represents the MW limit reflecting the next long-term planning upgrade by PacifiCorp Transmission at some future date beyond 2024. A bid in excess of 195 MW would still be compliant in the RFP subject to meeting all the requirements of the RFP.
105	4/23/2020	5/12/2020	Resource Types	Does PacifiCorp have a preference for smaller projects or is it equally acceptable to fill the full capacity for a location with a single project if more	PacifiCorp does not have preference for a certain size project.
106	4/23/2020	5/12/2020	Geography	economic? What is the rationale behind choosing the major substations associated with the Locational Capacity Limits listed in Appendix H-1? Are these locations where a resource such as storage would deliver the greatest value? Does interconnection capacity simply not exist at other substation locations?	The rationale behind providing Appendix H-1 was to respond to questions we received during the March 18, 2020 Oregon workshop with IE stakeholders on RFP modeling and scoring, the March 25, 2020 Pre-issuance RFP bidder's conference Utah, as well as questions we received to our 2020 All Source RFP email inbox (see Q&A ID#17). We received several questions about how to apply our Locational Capacity Limits to specific project locations. In response, we posted Appendix H-1 to align the Locational Capacity Limits to substations found in the publically available OASIS queue. Whether interconnection capacity exists at certain substation locations is not a question that was considered in the development of Appendix H-1.
107	4/23/2020	5/12/2020	Geography	Please confirm that a project connecting into a substation that is not listed in Appendix H-1 would still be considered compliant.	Projects are not required to be interconnecting to only those substations listed in Appendix H-1.
108	4/23/2020	5/12/2020	Resource Types	PacifiCorp's RFP states that it will accept a tolling contract bid for pumped storage hydro resources. For a system that exhibits similar characteristics as pumped storage hydro, (i.e. compressed air energy storage), would PAC consider a tolling contract bid as well as the BSA?	Yes.
109	4/23/2020	5/12/2020	Geography	How will projects that do not conform to the IRP Preferred Portfolio geographic clusters be judged during evaluation? Will they be deemed less competitive than an identical bid that is proposed in a preferred location? What is the methodology for incorporating this impact into the ranking process?	Depending on the number and resource types for bids submitted in such locations, PacifiCorp will utilize the same 150% format as described in Q&A ID# 104 above. But instead of using the IRP preferred portfolic capacity enabled by the estimated costs of potential network upgrades in that location as the starting point for evaluation, the MW capacity will be based on the interconnection capacity in that location at the time the IRP ran its evaluation.
110	4/27/2020	5/12/2020	Agreements / Contracting	We would like a clarification regarding Appendix C-3, Third Party Performance Report, specifically for solar projects. Does the report need to be prepared by an outside independent energy modeling firm, or can it be prepared by Bidder's inhouse engineering department using licensed industry-standard modeling software (such as PVSyst for example)?	PacifiCorp would prefer that all solar and wind resource assessments be prepared by an outside independent energy modeling firm to assure independence; however, we are aware that several bidders have "in-house" resource assessment teams that derive such estimates. Therefore, if a bidder provides both an "in-house" resources assessment, as well as the methodology and the required underlying data used for this assessment, PacifiCorp will accept the resource analysis provided for purposes of initial evaluation. PacifiCorp reserves the right to require a third-party assessment if it feels it cannot reproduce the bidder's in-house assessment.
111	4/13/2020	5/12/2020	Interconnection	We understand that for all proposals PacifiCorp requires a project to be eligible for inclusion in PacifiCorp ESM's network integration transmission service agreement as a designated Network Resource - does this requirement obligate the project to obtain a specific interconnection service status?	No, bidders can choose energy resource or network resource interconnection service. PacifiCorp ESM intends to designate any resource selected in this RFP as a network resource for purposes of using network transmission service under PacifiCorp's Network Integration Transmission Service Agreemen with PacifiCorp Transmission.
112	4/13/2020	5/12/2020	Interconnection	For projects located within PAC's service territory will PAC designate those resources as Network Resources regardless of the interconnection service requested as part of the interconnection request or service established within the interconnection agreement?	Yes.
113	4/28/2020	5/12/2020	Other	Will you allow different contracting structures to be listed on a single bid as an alternative (without paying another bid fee) rather than as an additional base bid? This would allow for direct comparison of different contracting structures and greater assurance of least-cost least-risk procurement and less ability to bias utility ownership.	No, different contracting structures will each need to be evaluated seperately. Therefore, they will be deemed as alternatives according to the RFP Main Document.

Q&A ID#	Date Q&A Submittted	Website Response	Interpretted Primary Q&A	Question	PacifiCorp Response
114	4/28/2020	Posting Date 5/12/2020	Topic Agreements / Contracting	It appears that you require the same amount and types of on-site data for wind and solar, but those are very different resources with different resource measurement methods. Would you allow solar projects to use satellite irradiance data in lieu of physically "on-site" measurements? We understand that on-site measurements for solar can vary widely on the same site, and requiring 1 or 2 years of that data has much less predictive value than more years of satellite data. In addition, can reports for resource data be produced by the bidder, if verifiable by PacifiCorp?	For required bid information, PacifiCorp will accept two years of solar irradiance satellite data provided from Solargis or SolarAnyway in lieu of on-site solar panel met data for all solar PPA and BTA bids. However, should a solar BTA bidder be selected to the initial shortlist, to remain on the initial shortlist, bidder must commit to install at least one solar monitoring station on the proposed solar site by November 15, 2020 with the ability to capture solar irradiance data for at least eight months and prior to being considered for the final shortlist. If a solar BTA bidder is selected to the final shortlist, bidder will commit to maintaining at least one on-site solar monitoring station through the entire construction period and provide the solar monitoring station and all collected solar irradiance data to PacifiCorp at BTA closing. NOTE: THIS RESPONSE REPLACES PRIOR Q&A RESPONSES #92, #93 AND #95.
115	4/28/2020	5/12/2020	Resource Types	What is your reasoning for allowing only "greenfield sites" to bid? Does this exclude sites around your retiring coal plants or other plants already serving PacifiCorp customers? It seems that projects adjacent to or expansions of existing projects can at times be more economical, are more likely to come to fruition (fewer permitting challenges) and their forecasted production is more accurate (given proximity to operating resource for which actual operational data is available).	Bidders are free to propose a new resource on a "brownfield" site (i.e., a parcel previously used for commercial or industrial purposes). With respect to bidding existing resources in this RFP, such resources under contract with PacifiCorp are already modeled in the IRP and the preferred portfolio that resulted from this modeling effort represents new, incremental resources. The RFP, in turn, seeks a portfolio of resources that aligns with the preferred portfolio. In regards to the economics of new resources, the interconnection queue as of January 31, 2020 shows approximately 43,000 MW of interconnection requests or executed LGIAs, thus ensuring a large robust and competitive pool of new resources available to the RFP. New resources bring the next generation of technology, design, and control into the portfolio. PacifiCorp believes that, based on past RFP experience, it is unlikely there will be limited, if any, existing facilities either directly interconnected or off-system, that would otherwise be eligible to bid and would do so. PacifiCorp has allowed existing projects to bid in previous RFPs and would consider a similar approach in the 2020AS RFP if parties support it subject to the following conditions: • Bidder cannot terminate an existing contract to bid into RFP • The existing contract must expire before the required on-line date as proposed in a bidder's bid.
116	4/28/2020	5/12/2020	Resource Types	For bids on third-party transmission systems: What proof will be required that transmission service capacity is available? Will it simply be a static query of OASIS reservations or also a forward-looking inquiry into potential retirements and transmission build-out?	Please see response to Q&A ID# 61.
117	4/28/2020	5/12/2020	Resource Types	How will projects be ranked according to their capacity contributions, particularly for co-located renewables plus storage? How will you determine their \$/kw ranking for the initial shortlist?	Please see response to Q&A ID# 13 and 104.
118	5/6/2020	5/12/2020	Agreements / Contracting	Does a PVSyst resource estimate report by itself satisfy the third party assessment requirement of the RFP, or does PacifiCorp require a third party expert who is independent from Bidder to generate the PVSyst resource estimate report?	Please see response to Q&A ID# 110.
119	5/12/2020	6/18/2020	Interconnection	Can you please let us know how PAC will look at suspended queue positions that have an LGIA?	If a bidder bids a project in the RFP that has an executed LGIA that is currently in suspension, PacifiCorp expects the bidder to confirm in its bid package (i) the expiration date for the LGIA suspension period; (ii) when bidder is proposing to remove the LGIA from suspension in the course of the RFP process; and (iii) what updates to the LGIA the bidder anticipates will be made upon the project's LGIA being taken out of suspension (e.g., estimated in-service date, changes in project size or technology). For purposes of initial bid evaluation, PacifiCorp will accept a bid that is associated with a suspended LGIA, provided all other RFP requirements are satisfied. If the bid is selected to the initial shortlist, PacifiCorp will consult with the bidder and scrutinize the facts associated with the suspended LGIA in more detail to confirm the reasonableness of bidder's proposal, in terms of estimated in-service date, and other facts relevant. During the transition interconnection cluster study period from October 2020 to April 2021, the bidder will confirm with PacifiCorp Transmission that its costs and schedule are still accurately captured in the suspended LGIA. If the bidder is selected to the final shortlist and approved/acknowledged by the Commissions, bidder will remove the project from suspension within 60 days of Commission decision.
120	5/12/2020	6/18/2020	Resource Types	As it relates to RFP proposals for Yakima need 395MW solar / 99MW battery, 1) When would a Washington project for delivery to Yakima be open into RFP? 2) Would off network delivery to Mid-C be accepted for Yakima using the Vantage-Pamona as long as project has firm transmission to Mid-C secured? In this case similar to previous question #28 – at what date is unredacted system impact study due for submission? 3) Would a Mid-C delivery need to be in Pac transmission queue by January 31st deadline?	PacifiCorp's response to the question posed in subpart (1) assumes the question refers to whether there is a requested commercial operation date for projects bid for delivery into PacifiCorp's Yakima area. As stated in the RFP, the requested COD for any resources bid in this RFP (for all proposed areas on PacifiCorp's system) remains by end of year 2024. In response to the question posed in subpart (2), the RFP does not specify or specifically limit the potential points of delivery on PacifiCorp's system for projects that are interconnecting to third party transmission systems (i.e., "off-system" or "off-network" projects). See response to Q&A ID# 28 regarding requirements involving transmission service for such proposed off-system resources. For proposed deliveries around the MidC market hub, there are multiple substations that comprise the various points of delivery of MidC, and of those points. Wanapum, Vantage, and Midway are physical points with direct connections to PacifiCorp's transmission system. The unredacted off-system interconnection system impact study (and associated materials related to the proposed transmission service to bring the output of the resource to a PacifiCorp point of delivery, as summarized in Q&A ID# 28) will be due by the RFP bid due date. Finally, PacifiCorp's response to the question posed in subpart (3) assumes this question relates only to an off-system resource(s) (i.e., a resource proposing to interconnect to a third-party transmission system). If so, the January 31st eligibility date for PacifiCorp Transmission's planned 2020 transitional cluster study does not apply. If a project is proposing to interconnect to PacifiCorp's transmission system, then PacifiCorp Transmission's rules for transfitional cluster study eligibility would apply, including the January 31st cut-off date.
121	5/13/2020	6/18/2020	Resource Types	I would like to inquire as to whether hydrogen storage and hydrogen fuel cell delivery interconnection would be considered as part of the BESS	Yes, such bids are acceptable, subject to the minimum bid requirements in the RFP. With respect to projects proposing to interconnect to PacifiCorp's transmission system, please note the requirements for transitional cluster eligibility, which include have a valid interconnection request submitted by January 31, 2020. Please see response to Q&A ID# 63.

Q&A ID#	Date Q&A Submittted	Website Response Posting Date	Interpretted Primary Q&A Topic	Question	PacifiCorp Response
122	5/17/2020	6/18/2020	Interconnection	How will the costs of Gateway South be modeled in the bid review process and proposal of the overall portfolio of chosen bids in the 2020 RFP? At page 26 of the RFP, Phase 1, you state: "Bids in the Wyoming east cluster area are expected to trigger Gateway South to be added and account for its cost as part of the initial shortlist modeling process and later in the final shortlist modeling and selection process." Intervest would hope that the bids interconnected to this line are not assessed the cost of the line, which should be socialized across the entire portfolio. How will those costs be "allocated" between and among bids and the proposed final portfolio?	Costs associated with Gateway South (GWS) will not be incorporated in the determination of the initial shortlist. It's important to understand the difference between project-allocated transmission costs and the evaluation of the GWS system investment. All projects that require GWS for interconnection into PacifiCorp's transmission system will only be assigned incremental costs, both direct assigned and network upgrade, that are outside the currently defined scope of the Gateway South project. However, the economic viability of GWS is contingent on the bids received as part the 2020AS RFP connecting to GWS. If the system benefits from the sum of both GWS and the new resources bid do not provide adequate system benefits to PacifiCorp's rate payers (very similar to EV 2020), both GWS and all associated bids requiring GWS may be abandoned.
123	5/20/2020	6/18/2020	Resource Types	With the completion of the Pomona-Vantage 230 kV PacifiCorp transmission project, is the Vantage Substation a viable point of delivery for the upcoming procurement?	The RFP does not limit proposed points of delivery. PacifiCorp assumes the question of "viable" refers to whether or not Vantage substation is a point with direct connection to PacifiCorp transmission system. If that was entirely the intent of the question, the response is "yes".
124	5/26/2020	6/18/2020	Geography	The draft RFP and related information make it clear how projects within each "load pocket" (e.g., Southern Oregon, Northern Utah, etc.) will be evaluated against other projects within the same load pocket. To what extent and how will projects within one load pocket be evaluated against projects in other load pockets? For example, how will Pacificorp account for an abundance (> 150% of the published locational initial shortlist capacity limit) of relatively high-value projects in one load pocket versus an absence of high-value projects in a separate load pocket?	PacifiCorp has stated in recent RFP workshops that the 150% capacity and technology cap is only an "indicator or marker" where PacifiCorp and the IEs should begin evaluating whether additional bids should be considered. PacifiCorp has committed to work closely with the IEs to assure that bids are not unfairly eliminated too early in the selection process. However, the "bubble" or load pocket concept was derived from the IRP topology providing guidelines to what transmission capacity could be available considering only the 2023-2024 timeline unique to this RFP. With the IE's involvement, the mix across locations may vary from the 150% limit in a location, ultimately based on bids submitted and resulting bid ranking by location.
125	6/5/2020	6/18/2020	Interconnection	There was a previously set date (in May I believe) to have submitted an interconnection application by that date in order to be considered for the RFP. My question is, would proposals who did not meet that interconnection application deadline still be considered if everything is met by the RFP deadline?	To be considered as an eligible bid in the RFP, all minimum eligibility requirements will need to be met as defined in the RFP.
126	6/8/2020	6/18/2020	Interconnection	Would PacifiCorp consider as "conforming" a proposal from a resource that has submitted a surplus interconnect service request under FERC Order No. 845 (to be paired with an operational resource) if the surplus interconnect request was made after January 31 2020?	Nothing in PacifiCorp's queue reform filing or FERC's May 12, 2020 order approving that filing changed the separate surplus service interconnection study process set out in PacifiCorp DATT Section 38.3. PacifiCorp transmission would therefore accept requests for surplus interconnection service – requests that, by definition, do not require new interconnection capacity and cannot cause network upgrades – submitted after the January 31, 2020 cut-off date for regular interconnection requests. As a result, PacifiCorp's RFP team would also consider a proposal from a resource that has submitted a surplus interconnection request after January 31, 2020 and has received a timely study evaluating that request.
127	6/8/2020	6/18/2020	Geography	I understand from PAC that, "The requirements for an off-system resource are as follows: The minimum eligibility requirements for off-system bidders include an unredacted interconnection system impact study with the third party transmission provider and documentation of the availability of, and request for, long-term, firm thirdparty transmission service from the resource's point of interconnection with the third party's system to a point of delivery on PacifiCorp's system that is acceptable to PacifiCorp, achievable by December 31, 2024. Transmission service documentation to PacifiCorp's system is two-fold; firm capacity is available on third-party transmission provider and bidder has made a request to the third-party transmission provider and bidder has made service to PacifiCorp's system."	Please see response to Q&A ID# 120. MID-C Remote is not an acceptable point of delivery. The RFP does not limit proposed points of delivery.
128	5/12/2020	6/18/2020	Resource Types	I understand that the current PacifiCorp RFP does not allow for floating solar. However, as it uses an existing resource without having to take up valuable farmland or tearing down forests and is being deployed widely outside the US, would your client reconsider incorporating floating solar as part of the RFP bid?	All resource types are eligible to bid in the RFP subject to meeting minimum eligibility requirements as defined in the RFP.
129	5/5/2020	6/18/2020	Geography	Is the McNary Substation (https://www.pacificorp.com/transmission/transmission- projects/energy-gateway/west-of-hemingway.html) considered in Walla Walla or W. Valley per the below Locational Capacity Limits provided by Pac	Walla Walla.