



Contra Costa County
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

COMMUNITY CHOICE ENERGY TECHNICAL STUDY

BID #: 1605-182

RELEASE DATE: JUNE 1, 2016

Proposal Due Date: JULY 1, 2016 NO LATER THAN 3:00 P.M. PST

**CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
PURCHASING SERVICES
255 GLACIER DRIVE
MARTINEZ, CALIFORNIA 94553**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
I INTRODUCTION	3
II PROJECT OVERVIEW	4
III QUALIFICATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS	6
IV EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCESS	7
V INSTRUCTIONS TO RESPONDENTS	8
VI SCOPE OF SERVICE	11
VII BILLING and INVOICING	19

ATTACHMENTS:

- EXHIBIT A – STATEMENT OF EXPERIENCE
- EXHIBIT B – PRICE PROPOSAL FORM
- EXHIBIT C – CUSTOMER REFERENCES
- EXHIBIT D – ANTI COLLUSION STATEMENT
- EXHIBIT E – CONTRA COSTA COUNTY BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY REGISTRATION FORM
- CONTRA COSTA COUNTY TERMS AND CONDITIONS

I INTRODUCTION

General Information

A. Purpose

Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development is seeking a proposal from a qualified and experienced consultant – an individual, a firm, and/or group of individuals, and/or firms to provide technical assistance on assessing the feasibility of a Community Choice Energy program in the County.

B. Calendar of Events

RFP Release Date	June 1, 2016
Deadline to submit written questions through Bidsync.com.	June 24, 2016
Proposal Due Date	July 1, 2016
Vendor Presentation Date	July 25, 2016 (estimated)
Contract Award Date	August 9, 2016 (estimated)
Project Begin Date	August 10, 2016 (estimated)

C. Proposal Submission

- Response to this RFP MUST be submitted electronically through the Bid Sync web-site – NO EXCEPTION.
- Late submittals WILL NOT be accepted – NO EXCEPTION
- Fax submittals WILL NOT be accepted – NO EXCEPTION

D. Vendor Registration

Firms must be registered with the County. See Exhibit E attached.

1. Statement of Purpose

Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development (County) seeks a consultant – an individual, a firm, and/or group of individuals, and/or firms, to assess the potential of developing a Community Choice Aggregation Program in Contra Costa County. Community Choice Aggregation (hereafter referred to as Community Choice Energy or CCE) allows local jurisdictions – county and city governments – to provide electricity generation service to customers currently served by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E). Marin Clean Energy (MCE), the State’s first CCE program, started operating in 2010, followed by Sonoma Clean Power (SCP) in 2014 and Lancaster Choice Energy (LCE) in 2015. CleanPower SF launches in May 2016, and Peninsula Clean Energy will launch in October, 2016. Many other communities across the State are currently exploring this energy model, including every county in the Bay Area. All of these programs were preceded by a study that assessed the overall technical, environmental and economic feasibility of launching a CCE program.

2. Background

Under a Community Choice Energy program, the CCE entity would become the default electricity provider to all electricity customers within the service area. Customers would have the ability to opt out of service from the CCE and return to bundled service from the incumbent utility, in this case Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E).

On October 13, 2015, the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors (Board) accepted the recommendations of its Internal Operations Committee (IOC) and directed County staff to initiate outreach to cities within Contra Costa County to determine the level of interest cities had in joining with the County to investigate three alternatives for potentially implementing Community Choice Energy in Contra Costa County. These three alternatives are:

1. Form a new Joint Powers Authority (JPA) of the County and interested cities within Contra Costa County for the purpose of CCE;
2. Form a new JPA in partnership with Alameda County, and interested cities in both counties; and
3. Join Marin Clean Energy (MCE)

At its meeting on February 29, 2016, the IOC directed the Department of Conservation and Development (DCD) to prepare a report to the full Board presenting the options for proceeding with potential implementation of CCE in the County’s jurisdiction: continue working with cities to complete a technical study of the three CCE alternatives mentioned above, or proceed with steps to join the CCE program known as Marin Clean Energy, or MCE. The Board unanimously decided at its meeting on March 15 to conduct a full technical study

to assess the advantages and disadvantages of each of the three CCE alternatives mentioned above.

3. Award Agreement

If the County determines, after further evaluation and negotiation, to award the Agreement, a Professional Services Contract shall be provided to the successful Bidder for the Bidder's signature. No proposal shall be binding upon the County until after the Agreement is signed by a duly authorized representative of both Bidder and the County.

All other factors being substantially equal, preference will be given to Bidders located within Contra Costa County.

4. Questions

All questions regarding the proposal will be accepted through the BidSync site only. The deadline for submitting questions for this RFP is on or before June 24, 2016 no later than 3:00 P.M. PST. All questions will be answered and disseminated to those registered on the BidSync website. Contact customer service if you need technical assistance with any part of the bid process; support@bidsync.com or call (800) 990-9339.

III QUALIFICATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS

To be considered, respondents must meet the following minimum qualifications:

- a. Firm(s) or individual shall demonstrate direct experience within and understand the California energy market, including relevant legislation and regulations applicable to CCE and its major participants – investor owned utilities, CA Independent System Operator, energy service providers and independent power producers, California Public Utilities Commission, and other key market players.
- b. Firm(s) or individual shall demonstrate an understanding of the CCE formation process in California including statutory and regulatory requirements, and best practices.
- c. Firm(s) or individual shall have experience in customer data requests and electricity load analysis.
- d. Firm(s) or individual shall demonstrate experience in resource planning and energy procurement.
- e. Firm(s) or individual shall demonstrate experience in rate setting /design and sensitivity analysis, including anticipated rate impacts related to varying levels of renewable energy procurement and local renewable project/program development as well as energy efficiency and demand reduction program implementation.
- f. Firm(s) or individual shall possess all permits, licenses, and professional credentials necessary to supply product and perform services specified under this RFP.

1. Selection Process

The proposal shall enable the County to evaluate the responsiveness and quality of the proposal to each of the RFP requirements. The evaluation of proposals will be performed by an evaluation committee. If an award is made, it will be made to the responsive and responsible Bidder that offers the County the greatest value based on an analysis involving a number of criteria including but not limited to:

- Proposer understanding, methodology and approach of the project
- Proposer past experience for similar projects
- Key personnel experience and resume
- Customer References
- Cost
- Oral Presentation and Interview

2. Proposals are Public Records

California Government Code Section 6250, the Public Records Act, defines a public record as any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public's business prepared, owned, used or retained by any state or local agency regardless of physical form or characteristics. The Public Records Act provides that public records shall be disclosed upon request and that any citizen has a right to inspect any public record, unless the document is exempted from disclosure.

Unless otherwise compelled by a court order, the County will not disclose any proposal while the County conducts its deliberative process in accordance with the procedures identified in this RFP. However, after the County either awards an agreement to a successful bidder, or rejects all proposals, the County shall consider each proposal subject to the public disclosure requirements of the California Public Records Act. Each bidder is hereby informed that, upon submittal of its proposal to the County in accordance with this RFP, the proposal becomes the property of Contra Costa County.

3. Protest Procedures

In the event a dispute arises concerning the proposal process prior to the award of the contract, the party wishing resolution of the dispute shall submit a request in writing to the Purchasing Services Manager in care of:

David Gould, Purchasing Services Manager
Contra Costa County
Public Works Department
255 Glacier Drive
Martinez CA, 94553

1. Format of Proposal

All proposals shall follow the same format. No exceptions to this format shall be accepted. To be accepted for evaluation, the proposal format shall address all required components in order. All proposals shall include the following components:

- a. Cover Letter – Signed by an authorized person
- b. Executive Summary
- c. Proposal – within a maximum of 15 pages, no smaller 12-point font, describe specific capabilities, approaches and proposed methodologies that demonstrate a clear understanding of the nature of the work to be performed described in Section VI under Scope of Service
- d. Resume of key persons who will be assigned on the project
- e. Statement of Experience – See Exhibit A
- f. Price Proposal Form – See Exhibit B
- g. Customer References – See Exhibit C
- h. Anti-Collusion Statement – See Exhibit D
- i. Contra Costa County Business Opportunity Registration Form – See Exhibit E
- j. Federal, State, and local permits and licenses
- k. Certificate of Insurance with Endorsement Letter

2. Customer References

Respondents shall provide a minimum of three (3) letters of references. Each letter must include the name of the firm, description of services that were provided, and the date of services and the contract amount for projects similar to the services requested in this RFP. See Exhibit C.

3. Licenses and Permits

Bidders shall possess all licenses, registrations and permits required by the State of California and the County of Contra Costa. Such licenses and permits are to be submitted to the County with the proposal or prior to the contract signing date.

4. Proposal Expenses

Respondents shall be fully responsible for all costs incurred in the development and submission of this RFP.

5. Organizational Conflicts of Interest

The responder warrants that, to the best of its knowledge and belief, and except as otherwise disclosed, there are no relevant facts or circumstances which could give rise to organizational conflicts of interest. An organizational conflict of interest exists when, because of existing or planned activities or because of relationships with other persons, a vendor is unable or potentially unable to render impartial assistance or advice to the

County, or the vendor's objectivity in performing the contract work is or might be otherwise impaired, or the vendor has an unfair competitive advantage. The responder agrees that, if after award, an organizational conflict of interest is discovered, an immediate and full disclosure in writing must be made to Contra Costa County Administrator's Office ("County") which must include a description of the action which the contractor has taken or proposes to take to avoid or mitigate such conflicts. If an organization conflict of interest is determined to exist, the County may, at its discretion, cancel the contract. In the event the responder was aware of an organizational conflict of interest prior to the award of the contract and did not disclose the conflict to County, the County may terminate the contract for default. The provisions of this clause must be included in all subcontracts for work to be performed similar to the service provided by the prime contractor, and the terms "contract," "contractor," and "contracting officer" modified appropriately to preserve the State's rights.

6. Respondents Responsibility

The bidder assumes sole responsibility for the complete effort required in submitting a bid proposal in response to this RFP. No special consideration will be given after bid proposals are opened because of a proposer's failure to be knowledgeable as to all of the requirements of this RFP.

7. Interpretation

Should any discrepancies, omissions, or doubt as to their meaning be found in the RFP specifications or requirements, the Respondent shall notify the County in writing through the BidSync website. The County will send written instructions or addenda to all participants in the RFP process. The County shall not be responsible for oral interpretations.

8. Reservations

The County reserves the right to do the following at any time and for its own convenience, at its sole discretion:

- To reject any and all proposals without indicating any reasons for such rejection,
- Terminate this RFP and issue a new Request for Proposals anytime thereafter,
- Extend any or all deadlines specified in the RFP, including deadlines for accepting proposals by issuing an Addendum at any time prior to the deadline for receipt of responses to the RFP,
- Procure any services specified in the RFP by other means,
- Disqualify any Respondent on the basis of any real or perceived conflict of interest or evidence of collusion that is disclosed by the proposal or other data available to the County. Such disqualification is at the sole discretion of the County,
- Reject the proposal of any Respondent that is in breach of or in default under any other agreement with the County,
- Reject any Respondent deemed by the County to be non-responsive, unreliable, unqualified or non-responsible.

9. Subcontract and Assignment

The Contract binds the heirs, successors, assigns and representatives of Contractor. Prior written consent of the County, subject to any required state or federal approval, is required before the Contractor may enter into subcontracts for any work contemplated under the Contract, or before the Contractor may assign the Contract or monies due or to become due, by operation of law or otherwise.

10. Addenda

No one is authorized to amend any of these documents in any respect by an oral statement or to make any representation or interpretation in conflict with their provisions. Any changes to these documents will be issued in writing via Addenda to be posted on the BidSync website.

VI SCOPE OF SERVICE

The Community Choice Energy technical study will – like similar studies in other jurisdictions – assess the overall size and potential of a CCE program in Contra Costa County (keeping in mind that at least five cities in the County are either current members of MCE or are applying to become members). The study will examine the potential to be rate competitive with PG&E, assess the potential for GHG reduction, and examine the possible economic development benefits of Community Choice Energy for the County, through the construction of renewable energy projects in and around Contra Costa County. As directed by the Board of Supervisors, the County is also interested in an examination not just of starting a new CCE program (either limited to jurisdictions within Contra Costa County or in partnership with jurisdictions in Alameda County) but also of joining MCE. At the highest level, the CCE study should examine the potential to meet the following goals:

- Overall rates that are equal to or less than PG&E for the default product.
- Voluntary products that increase the renewable and GHG-free content (e.g. 100% renewable option) to which cities or individual customers can “opt-up”.
- An electric supply portfolio with a lower greenhouse gas intensity than PG&E and an energy portfolio which includes as much local renewable development as is economically feasible.
- The County seeks a financially sustainable and flexible business model that supports investment in and the local development of distributed energy resources, as well as local programs such as energy efficiency, electric vehicle charging, energy storage and microgrid development.
- Implementation of energy projects that have tangible and quantifiable economic benefits to the region, including brownfield redevelopment and local jobs creation.

Task 1. Review the County’s aggregated load data provided by PG&E. The County has received authorization from all cities not currently in or seeking membership to MCE to collect PG&E load data on their behalf. The technical consultant will review, format, and import data into an analytical framework and prepare summary level data for residential, commercial, industrial and agricultural/ street lighting accounts. The data to be analyzed in the study will be from the following jurisdictions:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Unincorporated Contra Costa County | 9. Moraga |
| 2. Antioch | 10. Oakley |
| 3. Brentwood | 11. Orinda |
| 4. Clayton | 12. Pinole |
| 5. Concord | 13. Pittsburg |
| 6. Danville | 14. Pleasant Hill |
| 7. Hercules | 15. San Ramon |
| 8. Martinez | |

Task 2: Technical Analysis, Supply Scenarios and Financial Pro-Forma. For the main part of the study, the Consultant will do the following:

- 2.A *Load Forecast:* Prepare CCE/utility load forecast that reviews historical usage and projects future power demand requirements across all customer classes, taking into account growth in renewables (eg: rooftop solar) and other appropriate factors, such as compensation for line losses. The Consultant will create a load profile for specific rate class and customer sector populations, which can provide a composite CCE electrical load and load shape for all 15 jurisdictions. Key facilities that may be direct access customers should be excluded from the study as they would not automatically be enrolled in a CCE program. Please provide estimates based upon an anticipated 15% overall opt-out rate. The result of this assessment will estimate the number of megawatt hours (MWH) that will be required each year for the first ten years of the program (including renewable energy to comply with the state’s Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), along with peak megawatt (MW) demand requirements that meet current resource adequacy requirements (RAR).
- 2.B *Rate Analysis:* Prepare PG&E rate analysis with forecasts of future PG&E rate increases, based on historical prices and factors that may affect the rate of increase into the future (local generation construction, spot market pricing, renewable energy mandates and declining cost of renewables, etc.). Other factors may also include ancillary services, transmission congestion impacts, transmission scheduling coordination costs and other factors. This analysis should be presented in a scenario analysis, with high, medium and low estimates of future PG&E pricing for all rate classes. Other considerations to be included in this section are:
1. Identification of other factors that may affect rate comparison (examples include combinations of the following: high gas, low gas, high hydro, low hydro, etc., and rate restructuring);
 2. Investor Owned Utility (IOU) costs and surcharges such as PCIA/cost recovery surcharges embedded in rate forecast for direct comparison to CCE costs;
 3. Utility rate forecast under continued IOU service scenario;
 4. Based on IOU rate forecasts and other independent rate forecasts, compile electric generation service cost/ payment estimates for prospective CCE customers in consideration of applicable IOU rate schedules.
- 2.C *Supply Scenarios for Contra Costa County:* The consultant will develop a range of scenarios for the energy procurement requirements of the CCE. Each scenario will examine the likely rates and competitiveness with PG&E, given current energy market conditions and departing load surcharges. Each scenario will also estimate greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts compared to PG&E. The consultant should consider variations in how both the renewable and non-renewable portions of the power mix can be obtained (e.g., in-state, in-county, out-of-state, renewable energy credits, technology

preferences), and non-renewable portfolio attributes (e.g., system purchases, natural gas, hydro-electric). The precise scenarios should focus on Category 1 and 2 renewable resources (excluding unbundled renewable energy credits) and will be determined in consultation with County staff, but could include the following:

- Option 1/Baseline: RPS compliant, along with the same or similar greenhouse gas profile as PG&E. The first scenario should assume compliance with the 2020 RPS minimum of 33% and the 2030 minimum of 50%. This scenario should also seek to match the current (and forecasted) percentage of carbon-free electricity supply from PG&E. This scenario can therefore be considered the baseline and would assess the potential cost differential between a CCE program and PG&E, assuming a similar level of environmental performance.
- Option 2: Starting with 50% renewable content on the first day of service and moving towards 80% by Year 10 (these metrics can be adjusted based on consultations with County staff).
 - Note: Both options 1 and 2 should incorporate a voluntary, 100% renewable option with an assumption that a similar number of customers will select this option as did MCE and SCP. In addition, both scenarios should examine, to the extent possible, the availability of renewable energy that could be procured from within the State of California from facilities that use unionized labor and/or Project Labor Agreements.
- Options 3 and 4: Same as Options 1 and 2, but with a substantial portion of the power supply sourced from local renewable resources in and around Contra Costa County. In these scenarios, the consultant should assume the inclusion of Net Energy Metering (NEM) and Feed in Tariff (FiT) programs along with an aggressive local power development plan that would be developed with the aim of having a minimum of 25% of the total renewable energy supply met through NEM, FiT and other local renewable resources by Year 10 of the program. For the purposes of this RFP, the term “local” refers to power projects in Contra Costa and adjacent counties.
- This section should also include information about PG&E’s current power portfolio and GHG emissions factor, as well as its voluntary Solar Choice program.

2.D *Sensitivity Analysis:* The consultant should also include a sensitivity analyses for each supply scenario showing the projected impact to program costs, rate structure and customer rates for variations in the following input cost variables:

- Market prices for conventional (non-renewable) energy.
- Market prices and availability of carbon-free and qualified renewable energy sources based on preferred technologies.

- Changes in PG&E generation rates, including time of use rates and customer surcharges, including fluctuations in the PCIA.
- The possibility of a smaller program should some of the cities included in this study choose not to participate in a CCE Program.
- Changes in policies affecting local renewables and carbon-free resource development, including but not limited to: 1) possible changes in Net Energy Metering and Feed in Tariff policies, 2) possible reduction or elimination of the federal solar tax credit and production tax credit for wind power, 3) changes to the State RPS.
- Customer opt-out rates that exceed the baseline assumption of 15%.
- Potential impacts of a rise in energy efficiency/demand response technology, increase or decrease in resource adequacy and integrated resource planning requirements, and an increase in electric vehicle penetration over the 10-year horizon.

2.E *Pro-Forma Analysis:* The consultant should assess the overall cost-benefit potential to support a threshold decision to move forward with CCE. Costs shall include upfront program development and implementation costs as well as net ratepayer costs over the forecast period. Quantifiable benefits shall include annual and net savings over PG&E, net GHG reductions, expanded use of renewable energy resources and local economic development (job years created and indirect economic impacts).

1. Pro forma report, including cash flow analysis, detailing costs and projected benefits under four electric supply scenarios.
2. Pro forma reports detailing costs and projected benefits under sensitivity case assumptions.
3. Pro forma reports detailing costs and projected benefits of phasing in customer load over time.
4. Pro Forma development in consideration of one of the above-listed supply scenarios, and the decision as to which scenario to use will be made in conjunction with County staff. Assemble known and predictable cost-of-service variables and incorporate these into base-case analyses. Predictable cost-of-service variables include:
 - a. Energy Costs- Variable inputs for resource portfolio mixes to include:
 - i. Forecast spot market prices
 - ii. Long-term and short-term power contracts (for wholesale products such as 6X16, 7X24 power products)

- iii. Renewable Energy minimums as required under SBX1-2, or in excess of this minimum per electric supply scenarios
- iv. Transmission scheduling coordination costs
- v. Transmission congestion impacts
- vi. Ancillary services costs and other grid services
- b. Start-up costs
- c. Cost of Capital
- d. Operating and Maintenance Costs
 - i. Administrative and general expenses
 - ii. Staffing
 - iii. External technical/legal/marketing/PR support
 - iv. Billing, metering, and collections
 - v. Customer service (call center) and data management
 - vi. Scheduling and coordination
- e. Uncollected accounts
- f. Program reserves
- g. CCE Bonding for Reentry Fees
- h. PG&E surcharges, Cost-Recovery Mechanism [exit fees]
- i. Characterize and evaluate feed in tariff and net energy metering programs that would encourage development of renewable energy generation projects in the region by offering customers a sustained reliable payback on their investment in renewable energy and sustainable local generation system

Task 3: Economic Development Analysis and Local Project Assessment. As stated earlier, the County believes that local economic development potential will be a key interest for municipal decision-makers. To this end, the Consultant will undertake the following tasks.

3.A *Overall Job Impacts:* For each of the supply scenarios, the consultant should examine not just costs and GHG impacts but also conduct an economic analysis of the direct and indirect employment creation through existing economic development models such as JEDI or other industry- standard models to quantify potential economic impacts of various supply scenarios. The jobs analysis should identify a distinction between, and estimate both, “local jobs” and “local hires,” the former being jobs created within Contra Costa County and the latter being local jobs that are filled by Contra Costa

County residents. The job analysis should also address labor practices and job-quality metrics, such as prevailing wages, job training programs that serve low income populations, and other relevant labor practices that could be employed by a CCE program, particularly for the supply scenarios described above that involve a large component of locally-developed projects.

- 3.B *Initial Project Identification and Northern Waterfront Development Strategy:* The Consultant should provide an overall estimate of the technical potential for wind, solar, biomass and other renewable resources that have significant potential in Contra Costa County. The Consultant can initially refer to existing studies, such as the Bay Area Smart Energy 2020 report¹ and the EPA “Repowering America” database that respectively assess the technical renewable potential in the built environment and on brown-field sites. In addition, the Consultant should look at renewable potential in other areas of the County, particularly at the Northern Waterfront. The Consultant should include on their team the capacity of using tools like Google Earth to quantify the technical potential of solar resources in rural, undeveloped parts of the County, as well as large commercial and industrial zones. It is understood that this task is only looking at the technical potential, and the Consultant is not expected to interact with landowners or take any other action to assess the financial feasibility of these projects. The goal is to show policy makers and the broader community what the potential is to develop renewables in the County. However, it should be stressed that when many other factors are taken into account (landowner interest, project financing, interconnection ability, etc.), only a small portion of the overall technical potential may actually be implemented.

With regards to the Northern Waterfront initiative, the Consultant should explore ways in which a CCE program could dovetail with the County’s desire to redevelop this region through the integration of energy resources. The Consultant should interview public and private officials involved in the Initiative efforts and outline potential economic development ideas related to clean energy, such as solar and wind siting and engaging with large industries to implement CCE-related energy efficiency, combined heat and power, energy storage and other programs. The Consultant is encouraged to think creatively about potential ideas, using best practice case studies from around the country. The Consultant should also consider the fact that this part of the County already has a large number of fossil fuel generators and associated, grid-related infrastructure – and how this infrastructure could be helpful (eg: convenient grid interconnections) in encouraging alternative energy projects in this area.

Task 4: Comparative Analysis of Other CCE Options: Joining Marin Clean Energy or Alameda County CCE Program

The County would also like to assess the advantages and disadvantages of two other options

¹ http://pacificenvironment.org/downloads/BASE2020_Full_Report.pdf

besides a stand-alone Contra Costa CCE program: (a) having the County and as many cities as are interested join MCE Clean Energy; or (b) having the County and interested cities partner with Alameda County’s CCE program – East Bay Community Energy – currently in formation. The Consultant, using the key results from Task 2 as a basis for comparison, would look at similar criteria when evaluating the other two options, including rate-competitiveness, GHG reduction potential and local economic development. The Consultant should assess other, more subjective criteria, such as local governance and overall programmatic flexibility. The exact comparison criteria will be discussed with County staff prior to this portion of the technical study commencing. The Consultant will meet with officials from Alameda County and MCE as necessary.

The main deliverable for this section of the report will be a comparison table for each of the 3 CCE program alternatives under consideration and brief narrative explaining the rationale for any conclusions. The criteria the County would like to see used as the basis of comparison between CCE program alternatives include:

- Low and Stable Electricity Rates
- Reduction in GHG emissions
- Local Control and Governance
- Local Economic Development Benefits
- Costs and Risks to Participating Jurisdictions

The Consultant should put together a matrix (illustrative example below) comparing the qualitative and quantitative advantages and disadvantages of each option, including the option to do nothing and stay with PG&E bundled service.

Criterion	Form CCCo JPA	Join MCE	Form JPA with Alameda County	Stay with PG&E
Rates				
GHG Reduction Potential Over Forecast Period				
Local Control/Governance				
Local Economic Benefits				
Start Up Costs				
Program Risks				
Timing				

Key comparative issues to be discussed in the study should include, but not be limited to:

- Given what is known about MCE rates (and forecasted into the future), and given market conditions for wholesale electricity into which an Alameda County or Contra Costa CCE would be entering, are the generation rates likely to be lower for one option than another? The consultant should look at current and projected rates.
- Given the Contra Costa CCE supply scenarios, those contemplated by Alameda County, and MCE's future goals for renewable energy mix in their portfolio, is there one option that might provide better environmental (lower GHG emission) performance than another?
- In terms of governance and the ability to tailor CCE-related programs to Contra Costa County, what advantages/disadvantages might there be for joining MCE, which has a regional footprint that already includes several CCCo cities and a growing Board. What advantages/disadvantages might there be for joining Alameda County? Alameda County currently has a large Steering Committee, which may also result in a large board of directors.
- Similarly, assess the ability for a stand-alone CCE program to generate surplus revenues and the benefits and trade-offs of keeping the revenues local vs. the ability to leverage economies of scale within a more regional approach.
- The Consultant should assess the costs (including financing options), management and timing implications of starting a new CCE program compared to the costs/management/timing implications of joining MCE or Alameda County.
- The analysis should highlight any greater risks and benefits associated with starting a new JPA as compared to becoming a member of an existing one. It should acknowledge the potential reality of having different cities and customers within a single county served by more than one CCE program, and what those impacts and issues might be.

VII BILLING AND INVOICING

A. Payment Terms

Contractor shall submit a correct and complete invoice(s) to the County after the County accepted the deliverables. Payment terms are Net 30 days or best offer, after receipt of correct invoice.

B. Billing Rate

Responders shall submit total cost as in per project basis. See attached Exhibit B.

C. Prices

Prices offered by the proposer will be firm fix and not subject to increase during the term of any contractual agreement arising between the County and the successful proposer as a result of this RFP, unless otherwise stated.