

Evaluation Team Response to 83E Round 2 Bidder Questions

Out-of-State Resources

Question 1: Can a proposed Energy Storage System that interconnects into the ISO-NE PTF at or above 69 kV at a point of interconnection **located outside the Commonwealth** satisfy the definition of '**Transmission Project**', including where the point of interconnection connects directly, via a PTF element with no intervening substations, taps, or load, **to a substation located in the Commonwealth**? Are there any other requirements for BESS systems that are located outside of the Commonwealth, but within ISO-NE, so long as they are delivering into the Commonwealth?

Answer 1: Please see the answer to Question 2.

Question 2: We would appreciate clarification on the following:

Does a proposed Transmission Project that interconnects to the ISO-NE PTF at a point located outside of Massachusetts (e.g., in Connecticut) satisfy the Section 2.2.2.1 threshold requirement to demonstrate eligibility for a Clean Peak Standard Statement of Qualification? If not, is there any alternative pathway under this RFP for an out-of-state project to qualify as an eligible bidder, or is Massachusetts-based interconnection (distribution or transmission) a hard eligibility requirement for all proposals in this solicitation? Separately, has DOER issued, or does it anticipate issuing, a "Coordination Announcement" under Section 1.1.1 that would address participation by projects located in other New England states for this Round 2 solicitation?

Answer 2: Round 2 of Section 83E is for environmental attributes only and the only environmental attributes produced by energy storage systems that have value in Massachusetts are Clean Peak Energy Certificates (CPECs), resulting from eligible operation in the Clean Peak Energy Portfolio Standard (CPS). One eligibility criterion for transmission-connected energy storage systems in CPS is that they "shall be interconnected with the Transmission System in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts." Thus a transmission-connected project located outside of Massachusetts must be able to demonstrate that it is interconnected with the transmission system in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Siting

Question 1: Section 2.2.2.2 of the draft RFP states that "the bidder must demonstrate that it has control or an irrevocable option (conditioned only upon the payment of a reasonable amount) to acquire control over the site for its proposed energy storage project, including any additional land rights (including easements) that are necessary for the development, construction, interconnection and operation of the facility."

Our project includes a gen-tie line connecting the BESS to a National Grid substation. We have had substantive and positive discussions with National Grid regarding routing the gen-tie across its property; however, National Grid may not permit execution of the required easement until after the interconnection agreement is executed, which is expected to occur after the RFP submission deadline.

I expect other developers may face a similar situation. Could you please confirm that, for purposes of the RFP, it will be sufficient for a bidder to demonstrate full site control for the project site itself, as well as all required easements up to the utility-owned property, where the remaining utility easement cannot reasonably be secured until completion of the interconnection process?

Answer 1: Yes, for purposes of meeting the minimum threshold requirements under the RFP demonstrating full site control over the project site but not the gen-tie site is sufficient. Section 7.6 of Appendix A-7 requests that you provide the plan to obtain site control over the interconnection facilities site as part of the bid proposal.

Environmental Attribute Delivery Plan

Question 1: Please confirm the appropriate location within Appendix A (e.g., Section A-4, Environmental Attribute Delivery Plan) for disclosing that a Facility's CPECs are currently committed to a third party through a specified date, with delivery under the new Long-Term Contract beginning thereafter, so that this is not misinterpreted as a conflicting or duplicative sale of the same Environmental Attributes.

Answer 1: Section A-4, Environmental Attribute Delivery Plan, is an appropriate place to provide such a disclosure.

CPPD Form

Question 1: In CPPD Part V (Phase 1), a profile specific to 2012 weather patterns is requested, we do not have this data and will use a different TMY, please confirm this is acceptable.

Answer 1: A profile specific to 2012 weather patterns should be used. The evaluation team refers bidders to leverage external historical weather repositories.

Question 2: In Section 3.1, should the Round Trip Efficiency (%) be a value that covers all range of temperatures and years of the contract? Is it an estimated or guaranteed value?

Answer 2: The RTE should be an estimated value which covers the life of the project for all range of temperatures including any applicable augmentation, overbuilds, and degradation.

Question 3: In Section 3.1, if Charging and Discharging Efficiency (%) are not independently known, is it acceptable to answer that they are both included in the Roundtrip Efficiency (%) value?

Answer 3: If unknown, it would be preferable for the bidder to provide an estimated average charging and discharging efficiencies. Otherwise, if not provided, the Evaluation Team reserves the right to internally estimate the charging and discharging efficiencies.

Question 4: In Part IV, what is intended for Minimum Charge Rate for a battery that can be charged at any specified power level? 0MW is not allowed.

Answer 4: Please leave the minimum charge rate blank if 0 MW is not allowed.

Question 5: In Part V (Phase 1), please confirm that the degradation factor should be 1 if the system will be augmented to maintain the contracted capacity. And confirm that the overbuild can be shown as 1 if the battery supplier is responsible for sizing to meet the required capacity for the contracted number of years and this value is not known to bidder, or should an estimate be made?

Answer 5: Yes, if the augmentation schedule maintains the contracted capacity throughout the lifecycle of the project, the Evaluation Team expects a degradation factor of 1. However, the overbuilds should be shown as greater than 1. For example, if the overbuilds yielded an extra capacity build out of 120%, then the overbuild value for the corresponding month and year should be 1.2. The bidder should estimate these values, if not readily known to them.

Question 6: In Part V (Phase 1), some instructions are cut off in the Excel file

Answer 6: Upon review, the excel file opened by an internet browser can yield unexpected results. Please download the file to your desktop when reviewing. If instructions are still not clear, please provide more clarity on specific areas which are truncated.

Question 6: In Part V (Phase 1), please confirm that the degradation factor should be 1 if the system will be augmented to maintain the contracted capacity.

Answer 6: Please see the answer to question 4.