

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

RFP NO. PSC-18-08

**TECHNICAL CONSULTANT TO ADVISE THE COMMISSION ON FC 1130 -
MODERNIZING THE ENERGY DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM FOR INCREASED
SUSTAINABILITY (MEDSIS)**

Proposal Issue Date: March 1, 2018

Proposal Due Date: April 2, 2018, no later than 4:00 pm EDT

Contact: Jesse P. Clay, Jr.
Deputy Executive Director for Administrative Matters
Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia
1325 G Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005
Email: jclay@psc.dc.gov
Telephone: (202) 626-5145

SECTION 1- SCOPE OF WORK

1.0 Introduction

Pursuant to Order No. 19275, issued in *Formal Case No. 1130, In the Matter of the Investigation into Modernizing the Energy Delivery System for Increased Sustainability* (“MEDSIS”), the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia (“Commission”) requires the assistance of a consultant to implement Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the MEDSIS Initiative. The Commission anticipates a period of one year for the consultant to complete Phase 1 and Phase 2, which encompasses, among other tasks, the designation, facilitation, and final reporting on MEDSIS-related working groups.

1.1 Background and Purpose

The investigation into modernizing the energy delivery system in the District of Columbia was initiated in response to intervenors’ requests in both *Formal Case No. 1103* and *Formal Case No. 1123*. In consideration of intervenor requests, technological advancements in the energy industry, and changing consumer preferences, on June 12, 2015, the Commission issued Order No. 17912 which opened this proceeding to identify technologies and policies that can be implemented in the District to modernize the distribution energy delivery system for increased sustainability; and, in the near-term, to make the distribution energy delivery system more reliable, efficient, cost effective, and interactive. Order No. 17912 also established a series of workshops to be held in the proceeding; the first in October 2015, the second in November 2015, and the third on March 17, 2016. At the conclusion of the third workshop, the Commission announced that staff would prepare a MEDSIS Report that would address the comments and make recommendations on the next steps.

Additionally, as a result of the PHI-Exelon Merger approved by the Commission in Order No. 18148 on March 23, 2016, a \$21.55 million MEDSIS Pilot Project Fund Subaccount was created and the funds therein were directed to be used to support pilot projects related to energy delivery system modernization under consideration in *Formal Case No. 1130*.

On January 25, 2017, the Commission issued the MEDSIS Staff Report, which identified regulatory barriers to grid modernization, proposed parameters for evaluating pilot projects that would receive funding from the MEDSIS Pilot Project Fund Subaccount, and contained draft Notice of Proposed Rulemakings (NOPRs) to amend the Commission’s rules to accommodate grid modernization-related terms and technologies. On February 28, 2017, the Commission held a MEDSIS Town Hall Meeting to discuss the proposed pilot project parameters identified in the Staff Report.

After considering the comments filed on the MEDSIS Staff Report, on October 19, 2017, the Commission issued Order No. 19143, which included Staff’s proposed Vision Statement for the MEDSIS Initiative and invited public comment on whether any guiding principles should be included in the Commission’s vision statement; whether a full assessment of the current capabilities and characteristics of the District’s current energy delivery system is warranted at this

time; and, whether, and to what extent, a consultant would be useful to help move MEDSIS forward more expeditiously. The Commission also transferred *Formal Case No. 1143* (Pepco's proposed Demand Management Program for Electric Vehicle Charging) into the *Formal Case No. 1130* docket. The Commission also issued on November 3, 2017, four Notices of Proposed Rulemakings, proposing amendments to Commission rules to include grid modernization-related concepts and definitions. Thereafter comments were filed in the Formal Case No. 1130 docket on the content of Order No. 19143, the Vision Statement, and the NOPRs. In relation to the questions posed in Order No. 19143 regarding obtaining consultants, many commenters agreed that obtaining a consultant would be beneficial to move the MEDSIS Initiative forward more expeditiously.

On February 14, 2018, the Commission issued Order No. 19275, which adopted Staff's revised MEDSIS Vision Statement as the official "Vision Statement for the MEDSIS Initiative." In Order No. 19275, the Commission also recognized that several stakeholders favored the use of a consultant to establish and manage working groups. Therefore, the Commission notified stakeholders that it would soon issue an RFP to obtain a qualified consultant.

All information related to the MEDSIS Initiative, include the MEDSIS Staff Report, the MEDSIS Vision Statement, and Commission Orders, is accessible through the MEDSIS webpage at www.dcpsec.org/MEDSIS.

Commission Staff envisions that the MEDSIS Initiative will be carried out over the course of three (3) to five (5) years in four phases as described in broad detail in the following table:

Four Phases for the MEDSIS Initiative

Phase 1 – Stakeholder Engagement. In Phase 1, the selected Consultant will engage stakeholders through a technical conference or roundtable discussion to determine: (1) the appropriateness of conducting a system assessment; and (2) the appropriate working groups to establish in Phase 2 of the MEDSIS Initiative, with an initial focus on the establishment of a working group to address viable non-wires alternatives to capital investments as requested by the District Department of Energy & Environment and other stakeholders.

Phase 2 – Working Group Process. The Consultant will establish, and manage the MEDSIS stakeholder working group process to result in a Final Working Group Report for each.

Phase 3 – Working Group Recommendations. In Phase 3, the Commission will review Phase 2 working group reports and approve appropriate recommended action(s), including but not limited to, the project governance, selection, and management criteria for the pilot projects.

Phase 4 – MEDSIS Pilot Project Program

Pilot Project Selection. In accordance with the project governance, selection, and management criteria established by the Pilot Project Working Group in Phase 2, and approved by the Commission in Phase 3, the Consultant shall: (1) develop an RFP to solicit appropriate pilot projects; (2) evaluate and rank submitted proposals; (3) recommend which projects should be selected, and submit its selection and supporting

documentation to the Commission for review and approval.

Pilot Project Administration. The Consultant selected to administer the pilot projects shall: (1) track and submit a quarterly accounting of the funds in the MEDSIS Pilot Project Fund Subaccount; (2) establish a pilot project proposal database to monitor the progress of the selected projects; (3) track each pilot projects' compliance with established timelines and deliverables and submit recommended action(s) for projects that are non-compliant; (4) recommend the release of pilot project funds when each project reaches established milestones; and (5) submit a final report to the Commission when each pilot project has been completed.

Note: Phases 3 and 4 may be implemented concurrently.

Offerors should tailor their responses to this RFP to thoroughly demonstrate sufficient knowledge, skill, and resources to implement **Phases 1 and 2** as more fully described below. Offerors must have sufficient knowledge, experience, and resources to serve as a facilitator of the stakeholder process that will assist the Commission in (1) identifying technologies and policies that can be implemented in the District of Columbia to modernize the distribution energy delivery system for increased sustainability and (2) making the distribution energy delivery system more reliable, secure, affordable, interactive, and non-discriminatory.

1.2 Scope of Work for Phase 1 Stakeholder Engagement and Phase 2 Working Group Process

The Consultant shall analyze data and information from stakeholders, published reports, and other resources, as well as provide periodic reports to the Commission in writing and orally. The Consultant will ultimately develop final working group reports, which shall include recommendations for Phases 3 and 4 of the MEDSIS Initiative for the Commission's review and approval. All final Consultant-prepared material will be the property of the Commission and all reports prepared by the Consultant containing public information may be made available to the public.

The Consultant will be required to:

PHASE ONE

1.2.1 Review the FC1130 docket, including stakeholder comments, Commission Orders, the MEDSIS Staff Report, and the MEDSIS Vision Statement and:

- a. Engage stakeholders through a technical conference to determine: (1) the appropriateness of conducting a system assessment; and (2) the appropriate working groups to establish in Phase 2 of the MEDSIS Initiative, with an initial focus on the establishment of a working group to address viable non-wires alternatives to capital investments as requested by the District Department of the Energy and the Environment and other stakeholders. The technical conference

shall be scheduled no later than thirty (30) calendar days from the date of contract award. The purpose of the technical conference(s) is to:

- i. Determine whether a system assessment is necessary and identify the parameters of the system assessment. If determined necessary, the Consultant shall conduct the system assessment and submit a System Assessment Report to the Commission. (**Attachment F** provides a non-exhaustive list of pertinent formal cases and reports that the Consultant should review in determining the time and cost related to conducting a system assessment, if determined necessary.)
- ii. Recommend stakeholder working groups to establish in Phase 2, with an initial focus on the establishment of a working group to address viable non-wires alternatives to capital investments as requested by the District Department of Energy & Environment and other stakeholders.
 1. One of the working groups that shall be established will consider the MEDSIS Pilot Projects. The Pilot Project Working Group shall finalize the proposed parameters provided in Section VII of the MEDSIS Staff Report, including establishing clear project governance, selection, and management criteria for the pilot projects.
 2. Other potential working group topics include, but are not limited to: (1) Utility Distributed Integration Resource Planning (DIRP); (2) Distributed Energy Resources (DER); (3) Electric Vehicles, Energy Storage, Solar PV; and (4) consumer protection.
- b. Submit a detailed Technical Conference Report for Commission review and approval substantiating the formation of each recommended working group. The Technical Conference Report shall be submitted to the Commission review and approval.

PHASE TWO

- 1.2.2 Based on the Commission's review and approval of the Technical Conference Report, develop a detailed workplan, meeting schedule, and timelines for completion of the stakeholder working group process including, but not limited to: the expected date for the submission of a Final Working Group Report at the conclusion of each working group.
- 1.2.3 Gather and analyze data necessary for discussion at each stakeholder working group meeting.
- 1.2.4 Organize, attend, lead, and report on each stakeholder working group meeting.
- 1.2.5 Maintain the agenda and meeting minutes for each stakeholder working group meeting.

- 1.2.6** Submit a written quarterly report on the progress of each stakeholder working group.
- 1.2.7** Ensure that all Final Working Group Reports, with recommended actions for Phases 3 and 4 of the MEDSIS Initiative, are submitted to the Commission within 1 year of the contract award, unless extended under Section 2, Contract Term.

1.3 Logistics

All stakeholder working group meetings will be held either at the Commission, 1325 G Street, NW, Washington, DC, or at a location mutually agreed upon by the working group members and the consultant, provided that: (1) the meeting location is in the District of Columbia, and (2) no additional costs are incurred to hold the meeting at a location other than the Commission. The Contractor may facilitate working group meetings in person or remotely. Any working group meeting to be held at the Commission shall be scheduled with the Commission's Secretary Office at least ten (10) days in advance, indicating the type of meeting and approximate number of participants.

1.4 Deliverables

Item	Description	Frequency	Approximate Timeframe
1.	Technical Conference	Once	30 days from award
2.	System Assessment Report, if needed	Once	TBD
3.	Technical Conference Report	Once	TBD
4.	Final Working Group Reports	Conclusion of each group	Within 1 year after contract award
5.	Working Group Progress Report	Quarterly (4)	Within 1 year after contract award

SECTION 2 – CONTRACT TERM

- 2.1** The contract will be for one (1) year from the date of contract award.
- 2.2 Option to Extend** - The Commission may extend the term of this Contract for one (1) one (1) year period or fraction thereof provided the Commission shall give the Consultant preliminary written notice of its intent to extend at least thirty days before the contract expires. The Consultant may waive the thirty (30) day preliminary notice requirement by providing a written waiver to the Contracting Officer prior to expiration of the contract. The preliminary notice does not commit the Commission to an extension. The total duration of this contract, including the exercise of any options under this clause, shall not exceed two (2) years.

SECTION 3 – AUTHORITY

This Request for Proposals (“RFP”) is released pursuant to the Commission’s procurement regulations, 15 DCMR § 2200 *et. seq.* (2000).

SECTION 4 – RFP AVAILABILITY

This RFP will be published on the Commission’s website at www.dcpssc.org. A copy of the RFP also may be obtained by e-mail or written request to:

Jesse P. Clay, Jr.
Deputy Executive Director for Administrative Matters
Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia
1325 G Street, NW, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005
Email: jclay@psc.dc.gov

SECTION 5 – QUESTIONS

Any company or person wishing to obtain clarifying information about this RFP may submit questions *in writing only* to:

Karen M. Hester
Procurement Analyst
Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia
1325 G Street, NW, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005
Email: khester@psc.dc.gov

All questions must be in writing and submitted to the Commission on or before **March 12, 2018** to the attention of Karen M. Hester at the above-stated Commission’s office or email address. The RFP number, PSC-18-08, must be identified in all written requests.

In order to assure that no prospective Offeror may obtain a competitive advantage because of acquisition of information unknown to other prospective Offerors, answers to all written questions timely received will be posted on the Commission’s Contracting and Procurement webpage, at www.dcpssc.org under RFP No. PSC-18-08.

SECTION 6 – TIMING/DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

The closing date and time for proposals is Thursday, **April 2, 2018 at 4:00 p.m., EDT**. Offerors assume the sole responsibility for timely delivery of their submission, regardless of the method of delivery. Any proposals received after the closing date and time will not be considered. Submissions shall be proffered as one (1) original and three (3) copies, and each Offeror’s submission shall be placed in a sealed envelope or box conspicuously marked:

“Submission in Response to RFP No. PSC-18-08, Technical Consultant to Advise the Commission on FC 1130 - Modernizing the Energy Distribution System for Increased Sustainability (MEDSIS)”

Proposals must be delivered or mailed to:

Jesse P. Clay, Jr.
Deputy Executive Director for Administrative Matters
Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia
1325 G Street, NW, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005

SECTION 7 – ELIGIBLE OFFERORS

To be eligible, Offerors must be neutral and impartial and not advocate specific positions to the Commission in proceedings not related to matters within the Scope of Work in this RFP. Eligible Offerors must demonstrate technical capabilities, competence, and resources to perform the duties as delineated in the Scope of Work, Section 1, of this RFP.

SECTION 8 - PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

8.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

A. Technical Approach and Work Plan (45 points)

1. The thoroughness, clarity and soundness of the proposed approaches in meeting the requirements and providing the services as outlined in the RFP, Section 1, Scope of Work, the method of adjusting to changing circumstances, the method of tracking the progress of the project, and the method of communicating with Commission staff. **20 points**
2. A proposed work plan for implementing the project which demonstrates the Offeror’s project management expertise, understanding of the project, and ability to meet the deadlines for the scheduled deliverables. **25 points**

B. Experience and Project Staff (40 Points)

1. Current and past experience and quality of past performance of the Offeror in providing technical consulting services similar to those required by this solicitation to utility and/or government clients. **20 points**
2. The collective qualifications, experiences, capabilities and quality of past performance of the Offeror’s team; the appropriate proportion of work to be performed by each team member, identified by name; and the experience,

qualifications, capabilities and quality of past performance of the individual team members proposed to perform the required tasks. **20 points**

- 8.2** The Commission will use the following technical rating scale as a guide when assigning the final total technical points to each offeror's proposal:

Technical Rating Scale

Numerical Point Rating	Rating	Description
0 -59	Unacceptable	Fails to meet minimum requirements, major deficiencies
60- 69	Poor	Marginally meets minimum requirements, significant deficiencies.
70 – 79	Acceptable	Meets requirements, only minor deficiencies.
80 – 89	Good	Meets requirements, no deficiencies.
90 – 100	Excellent	Exceeds most, if not all requirements, no deficiencies.

8.3 COST/PRICE FACTORS FOR AWARD

8.3.1 Price – 15 Points

- 8.3.2** It is estimated that the cost of services required by this RFP will be in the range of \$200,000 to \$400,000.

- 8.3.3** Price will initially be evaluated using an objective rating scale with a value of 15 points. The Offeror's Price Proposal will also be assessed for completeness and realism. Cost will be closely considered in performing an integrated assessment of the Proposal leading to the selection of the best value Offeror.

- a. **Completeness:** To be complete, Offeror must provide all of the cost/pricing data that is necessary to adequately evaluate the Proposal. The Commission will assess the extent to which the cost/price Proposal complies with the content and format requirements set forth in the solicitation.
- b. **Realism:** Realism is evaluated by assessing the compatibility of proposed costs with the Proposal's scope and efforts. Cost realism analysis seeks to ensure that proposed costs are consistent with the SOW requirements. If an Offeror's proposed cost/price is evaluated as unrealistically low or high, compared to anticipated costs of performance, it may be interpreted by the Commission as an inherent lack of understanding of requirements and may adversely affect the Offeror's evaluation rating and potential to be awarded the contract.

SECTION 9 - ECONOMIC INCLUSION

Preference for Local and Disadvantaged Business Enterprises or Businesses Operating in an Enterprise Zone

Under the provisions of the “Small and Local Business Enterprise Development and Assistance Act of 2005”, as amended, D.C. Official Code § 2-218.01 *et seq.* (the Act), the District shall apply preferences in evaluating proposals from businesses that are small, local, disadvantaged, resident-owned, longtime resident, veteran-owned, local manufacturing, or local with a principal office located in an enterprise zone of the District of Columbia. In accordance with these laws, the following preferences shall be awarded in evaluating an Offeror’s proposal:

- 9.1 Any prime contractor that is a small business enterprise (SBE) certified by the Department of Small and Local Business Development (DSLBD) will receive the addition of three (3) points on a 100-point scale added to the overall score for proposals submitted by the SBE in response to this Request for Proposals (RFP).
- 9.2 Any prime contractor that is a resident-owned business (ROB) certified by DSLBD will receive the addition of five (5) points on a 100-point scale added to the overall score for proposals submitted by the ROB in response to this RFP.
- 9.3 Any prime contractor that is a longtime resident business (LRB) certified by DSLBD will receive the addition of five (5) points on a 100-point scale added to the overall score for proposals submitted by the LRB in response to this RFP.
- 9.4 Any prime contractor that is a local business enterprise (LBE) certified by DSLBD will receive the addition of two (2) points on a 100-point scale added to the overall score for proposals submitted by the LBE in response to this RFP.
- 9.5 Any prime contractor that is a local business enterprise with its principal offices located in an enterprise zone (DZE) certified by DSLBD will receive the addition of two (2) points on a 100-point scale added to the overall score for proposals submitted by the DZE in response to this RFP.
- 9.6 Any prime contractor that is a disadvantaged business enterprise (DBE) certified by DSLBD will receive the addition of two (2) points on a 100-point scale added to the overall score for proposals submitted by the DBE in response to this RFP.
- 9.7 Any prime contractor that is a veteran-owned business (VOB) certified by DSLBD will receive the addition of two (2) points on a 100-point scale added to the overall score for proposals submitted by the VOB in response to this RFP.
- 9.8 Any prime contractor that is a local manufacturing business enterprise (LMBE) certified by DSLBD will receive the addition of two (2) points on a 100-point scale added to the overall score for proposals submitted by the LMBE in response to this RFP.

A Certified Business Enterprise (“CBE”) shall be entitled to any or all of the preferences provided in this section, but in no case shall a CBE be entitled to a preference of more than 12 points or a reduction in price of more than 12 percent.

Information: For information regarding the application process, contact the DSLBD at the following address or telephone number:

Department of Small and Local Business Development
Government of the District of Columbia
One Judiciary Square
441 - 4th Street, N.W., 9th Floor, Suite 970 N
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 727-3900 (Telephone Number)
(202) 724-3786 (Facsimile Number)

Any Offeror with Local Business Enterprise or Disadvantaged Business Enterprise certification as a joint venture or constituent entity, shall be entitled to the applicable preference points provided for in the Small, Local, and Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Development and Assistance Act, Part D, Subpart 2, Sec. 2343 in direct proportion to the percentage of the effort to be performed by the Local Business Enterprise or Disadvantaged Business Enterprise. A copy of the certification acknowledgment letter must be submitted with the Offeror's Proposal.

SECTION 10 - EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

- 10.1** Each proposal will be scored on a scale of 1 to 100 points. In addition, Offerors will be eligible to receive up to 12 preference points as described in Section 9 of this RFP for participation by Local, Small or Disadvantaged Business Enterprises. Thus, the maximum number of points possible is 112.
- 10.2** The Commission reserves the right to reject any or all proposals determined to be inadequate or unacceptable, or to cancel this Request for Proposal, regardless of evaluation, if it is determined to be in the best interest of the Commission.
- 10.3** The Commission may award a contract on the basis of initial offers received, without discussion. Therefore, each initial proposal should contain the Offeror’s best terms.

10.4 Evaluation Committee

Each proposal shall be evaluated by an Evaluation Committee in accordance with the Evaluation Criteria. The Evaluation Committee shall prepare a written report summarizing its findings and submit the same to the selection official(s). The selection official will consider the report prepared by the Evaluation Committee, in making an award decision.

10.5 Oral Presentation

The Commission reserves the right to interview Offerors in the competitive range if necessary. If the Commission conducts such interviews, each Offeror within the competitive range shall make an oral presentation to the Commission's Evaluation Committee, and participate in a question and answer session. The purpose of the oral presentation and the question and answer session is to permit the Evaluation Committee to fully understand and assess the qualifications of each Offeror and the Offeror's key personnel.

10.5.1 Length of Oral Presentation

Each Offeror will be given up to 30 minutes to make the presentation. At the end of the initial presentation, there will be a break for approximately 15 minutes for the Evaluation Committee to assess the presentation and prepare questions. The Offeror will then respond to questions from the Commission's Evaluation Committee for no more than 30 minutes.

10.5.2 Schedule

The order of presentation will be selected randomly and the Offerors will be informed of their presentation date before the beginning of oral presentations. The Commission reserves the right to reschedule any Offeror's presentation at the discretion of the contracting officer.

10.5.3 Offeror Attendees

The oral presentation will be made by the Offeror's personnel who will be assigned the key jobs for this project. Each Offeror will be limited to 3 persons. The job functions of the persons attending the presentation will be considered to be an indication of the Offeror's assessment of the key areas of responsibility that are deemed essential to the successful completion of the project.

10.5.4 Topics

The Offeror may present information about its capabilities and special qualifications, including the qualifications of key personnel. The Offeror may be asked to present its Work Plan.

SECTION 11 - BASIS OF AWARD

- 11.1** The Commission will award the contract to the responsible Offeror whose offer conforms to the solicitation and is most advantageous to the Commission, taking into consideration cost and other criteria set forth in this document and based upon the specified evaluation criteria. The Commission will evaluate each Offeror's price against its technical proposal to determine which combination of price and technical merit is most advantageous to the Commission.
- 11.2** In evaluating and selecting an Offeror, the Commission may award the contract to a higher-rated, higher-priced Offeror where the offer is consistent with the evaluation criteria set forth herein, and the Commission determines that any added benefits are worth the price

premium. While the Commission shall strive to exercise maximum objectivity, the source selection process by its very nature is subjective and professional judgment is implicit and necessary.

SECTION 12 – PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

This section outlines specific information necessary for the proper organization of the Offeror's proposal and manner in which the proposal should be proffered. Proposals submitted in response to this request must meet the following conditions to be considered for selection. Proposals submitted via facsimile will not be accepted under any circumstances.

PROPOSALS MUST BE WRITTEN ENTIRELY ON 8½" x 11" PAPER. PROPOSALS SHOULD INCLUDE NECESSARY APPENDICES AND ATTACHMENTS. PROPOSALS SHOULD BE STAPLED IN THE TOP LEFT CORNER OR BOUND IN A 3-RING BINDER. PROPOSALS MUST BE SUBMITTED IN A MANNER THAT DOES NOT PRESENT ANY BENEFIT, KEEPSAKE, OR VALUE FOR MEMBERS OF THE REVIEW PANEL.

A proposal must be submitted in the format outlined herein with a Table of Contents. Pages of the proposal must be numbered with index tabs included for each section.

12.1 Technical Proposal

The Offeror's technical proposal must demonstrate the expertise to ensure that the stakeholder process supports the District of Columbia's energy policies and objectives for grid modernization. The Offeror's technical proposal must demonstrate qualifications, experience, and level of expertise related to:

- (1) grid modernization initiatives;
- (2) the District of Columbia's energy delivery systems;
- (3) the District's energy policies and objectives;
- (4) distribution system and distributed resource planning processes;
- (5) competitive energy markets and consumer choice;
- (6) cost recovery for grid modernization infrastructure;
- (7) facilitating productive working groups; and
- (8) administering energy-related pilot projects.

12.1.1 Executive Summary

Each Offeror should provide a summary of no more than two pages of the information contained in the following sections.

12.2.2 General Team Information and Firm(s) Data

Each Offeror should provide the following information for the firm and any subconsultants.

- a. Name(s), address(es), and role(s) of each firm (including all sub-consultants)
- b. Firm profile(s), including:
 - i. Age;
 - ii. Firm history(ies);
 - iii. Firm size(s);
 - iv. Areas of specialty/concentration;
 - v. Current firm workload(s) projected over the next six months; and
 - vi. Provide a list of any contracts held by the Offeror where the contract was terminated (either for default or convenience). This list should also identify any contracts that resulted in litigation or arbitration. If the Offeror has multiple offices, only contracts held by the office submitting this proposal need be listed.

12.3 Corporate Information

Offerors, if incorporated, shall attach to the proposal, a current franchise tax Certificate of Good Standing, issued by the District of Columbia Comptroller's Office. Offerors shall provide to the Commission, Offeror's 9-digit Federal Employer's Identification Number (FEI#) or Social Security Number (SSN) if Offeror is an individual. If a domestic corporation, Offerors shall also provide to the Commission the corporation's charter number issued by the District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs. If a foreign corporation, Offerors shall also provide to the Commission a copy of a valid Certificate of Authority to do business in the District of Columbia, issued by the District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs.

12.4 Technical Approach and Work Plan

The Offeror must describe clearly, specifically, and as completely as possible the details of its technical approach for carrying out the responsibilities of the duties associated with the Scope of Work, Section 1, of this RFP, including a mechanism and timeline for all deliverables. The proposal must include a schedule that identifies key milestones, tasks, activities, and events pertinent to the tasks and duties as outlined in the Scope of Work, Section 1 of this RFP for completion within one (1) year from the date of contract award.

12.5 Prior Experience and Qualifications

Describe the Offeror's prior experience performing activities similar to the duties and responsibilities as outlined in the Scope of Work, Section 1, of this RFP. If the Offeror has not worked on a similar project, please provide evidence of experience relevant to the duties as outlined in the Scope of Work, Section 1, of this RFP. The Offeror should demonstrate that it is familiar with Title 34 of the D.C. Code as it relates to energy matters and have extensive knowledge of energy issues and policies. Additionally, the Offeror should provide at least three references using the past Performance Evaluation Form, **Attachment E**, preferably clients for whom similar work has been previously performed, including contact information for such client.

12.6 Project Staff

Identify the persons who will perform the work described in this RFP and provide a detailed resume for each individual that describes the qualifications applicable to the performance of the tasks for which they would be responsible. Please include an organizational chart showing reporting relationships of team personnel. The Commission must be notified of any personnel changes if individuals assigned to work on this project are relieved of their responsibilities. Offerors shall designate one individual as the project manager and this person shall be responsible for project management, reporting, coordination, and accountability for the entire project.

12.7 Price Proposal

On Attachment B, Bid Form, Offerors are required to estimate the cost of performing the work described in Section 1 of this RFP. In addition, each Offeror must provide a unit price resource schedule which shows the level of effort by position, hourly labor rate, and estimated number of hours that the Offeror believes will be necessary. This resource schedule will be evaluated to determine whether the Offeror fully understands the project and has allocated appropriate resources for this project.

SECTION 13 - ANTICIPATED SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

The following reflects the Commission's anticipated schedule of activities. The Commission reserves the right to amend this schedule as necessary. Any changes to the schedule will be posted on the Commission's website at www.dcpsc.org.

Publish RFP on the Commission website	March 1, 2018
RFP questions from potential Offerors due to the Commission	March 12, 2018
Responses to questions posted on the Commission website	March 19, 2018
Deadline for submission of Offeror's proposals	April 2, 2018
Determination of Offerors in the Competitive Range	April 11, 2018
Interviews	April 18 – 20, 2018
Best and Final Offers Due	April 26, 2018
Selection of Offeror approved by Commission	May 7, 2018
Contract Award	May 9, 2018
Commencement of project activities	Immediately

SECTION 14 – LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - Special Provisions

Attachment B – Bid Form

Attachment C - Disclosure Statement

Attachment D – Tax Certification Affidavit

Attachment E – Past Performance Evaluation Form

Attachment F - Formal Cases and Reports for System Assessment

ATTACHMENT A

SECTION A: SPECIAL PROVISIONS**A.1 Time**

Unless otherwise specified in this RFP, time, if stated in number of days, shall include Saturdays, Sundays and holidays.

A.2 Licensing, Accreditation and Registration

The selected Offeror shall comply with all applicable District of Columbia and federal licensing, accreditation, and registration requirements and standards necessary for the performance of the contract.

A.3 Limitation of Authority

Only the Commission or a person with prior written authority from the Commission shall have the express, implied, or apparent authority to alter, amend, modify, or waive any clause or condition of the contract. Furthermore, any alteration, amendment, modification, or waiver of any clause or condition of this RFP is not effective or binding unless made in writing and signed by the Commission or its authorized representative.

A.4 Conformance with Laws

It shall be the responsibility of the selected Offeror to perform under the contract in conformance with the Commission's procurement regulations and all statutes, laws, codes, ordinances, regulations, rules, requirements, orders, and policies of governmental bodies, including, without limitation, the U.S. Government and the District of Columbia government; and it is the sole responsibility of the selected Offeror to identify the procurement regulations, statutes, laws, codes, ordinances, regulations, rules, requirements, orders and policies that apply and their effect.

A.5 Statement Regarding Potential Conflicts of Interest

Each Offeror shall identify any relationships between itself or its employees and the companies under the jurisdiction of the Commission, or any parent, subsidiary or affiliate, of such companies. The extent, nature and time aspects must be identified. If there have been no such relationships, a statement to that effect shall be included in the proposal. Failure to provide the statement on potential conflicts of interest will automatically disqualify the Offeror.

A.6 Financial Capability

Prior to award, an Offeror may be required to describe their financial capability to complete the work required and to sustain operations for the term of the contract. Acceptable

evidence of financial capability would include an audited financial statement within the past 12 months from a certified public accountant.

A.7 Insurance

A.7.1 Required Policies

The selected Offeror shall be required to maintain: (i) workers compensation insurance in accordance with statutory limits; (ii) a general liability insurance policy with limits of at least the value of the contract; (iii) an employer's liability policy; and (iv) an umbrella policy providing coverage at least as extensive as the underlying policies.

A.7.2 Required Endorsements

All policies required hereunder must show the selected Offeror as the certificate holder and must contain language requiring a sixty (60) day prior notification directly to the Commission.

All insurance policies shall be issued by insurers licensed to do business in the District of Columbia and any insuring company is required to have a minimum rating of an A-, Class C in Best's Key Rating Guide published by A.M. Best and Company, Inc.

A.8 Corporate Information

Offerors, if incorporated, shall attach to the proposal, a current franchise tax Certificate of Good Standing, issued by the District of Columbia's Office of Tax and Revenue. Offerors shall provide to the Commission, the 9-digit Federal Employer's Identification Number (FEI#) or Social Security Number (SSN) if Offeror is an individual. If a domestic corporation, Offerors shall also provide to the Commission the corporation's charter number issued by the District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs. If a foreign corporation, Offerors shall also provide to the Commission a copy of a valid Certificate of Authority to do business in the District of Columbia, issued by the District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs.

A.9 Debarment and Suspension

By submitting a proposal to the Commission, Offerors understand, agree, and certify that:

- a. Submitting a proposal with a false statement is a material breach of contract and shall void the submitted proposal and any resulting contract, and the Offeror shall be removed from all future contracting opportunities with the District of Columbia Public Service Commission. The Commission may debar and suspend the Offeror for: (i) engaging in contract fraud or a criminal offense incident to obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public contract or subcontract (Payments due under the contract will be applied towards any debt, including but not limited to delinquent taxes, that is owed the District of Columbia); (ii) violating federal or state antitrust statutes related

to the submission of bids and proposals; (iii) engaging in acts involving embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, receiving stolen property, false statements, tax evasion, or any other offense indicating a lack of business integrity or business honesty; and, (iv) being convicted of any other offense that indicates a lack of business integrity of present responsibility as a Offeror.

- b. The Commission, in its discretion, may debar or suspend any Offeror as a result of: (i) willful failure to perform in accordance with the specifications within the time limit provided in a contract; (ii) a record of failure to perform or of unsatisfactory performance of the terms of one or more contracts; or (iii) false assertion of status giving rise to special benefits under the laws of the District of Columbia.

A.10 Acknowledgment of Amendments and Addenda

Offerors shall acknowledge receipt of any amendment(s) or addenda to this RFP by: (i) signing and returning the amendment(s) or addenda or (ii) letter or telegram, including mailgrams or by facsimile. The Commission must receive the acknowledgment by the date and time specified for receipt of submissions. An Offeror's failure to acknowledge an amendment(s) or addenda may result in rejection of its proposal.

A.11 Proposal Acceptance Period

Submissions shall be irrevocable and remain in full force and effect for a period not less than 120 days after receipt of submissions.

SECTION B: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

B.2 Explanations to Prospective Offerors

Offerors should carefully examine this RFP and all amendments, addenda, or other revisions, and be thoroughly familiar with all requirements prior to proffering a submission. Should an Offeror find discrepancies or ambiguities in, or omissions from, the RFP and amendments, addenda or revisions, or otherwise desire an explanation or interpretation of the RFP, any amendments, addenda, or revisions, it must submit a request for interpretation or correction in writing. Any information given to an Offeror concerning the solicitation shall be furnished promptly to all other Offerors as an amendment or addendum to this RFP if, in the sole discretion of the Commission, that information is necessary in proffering submissions or if the lack thereof would be prejudicial to any other prospective Offerors. Oral explanations or instructions given before the award of the contract shall not be binding.

B.3 Protests and Disputes

Protests and disputes shall be governed by Sections 2206 and 2207 of the Commission's Procurement regulations (15 DCMR §§ 2206-7). As provided in Section 2206.1, protests alleging defects in this solicitation must be filed within ten (10) business days of the solicitation. If an alleged defect does not exist in this initial RFP, but was incorporated

into the RFP by an amendment or addendum, a protest based on that defect must be filed before the next closing time Established for proffering submissions. In all other cases, a protester shall file the protest within ten (10) days after the protester knows or should have known, whichever is earlier, of the facts and circumstances upon which the protest is based. All protests must be made in writing to the Office of the Commission Secretary and must be filed in duplicate. Protests shall be served on the Commission by obtaining written and dated acknowledgment of receipt from the Office of the Commission Secretary. Protests received by the Commission after the indicated period shall not be considered. To expedite handling of protests, the envelope shall be labeled "Protest." The written protest shall be signed by the protester or its representative and shall include at a minimum the following:

1. Name, address, and telephone number of the protester;
2. Appropriate identification of the procurement, i.e., the RFP number and, if a contract has been awarded, its number;
3. A concise statement of the grounds for the protest and a specific request for a ruling from the Chief Contracting Officer of the Commission; and
4. Supporting exhibits, evidence or documents to substantiate any claims, unless not available within the filing time, in which case the expected availability date should be indicated.

B.4 Contract Award

This procurement is being conducted in accordance with the Commission's procurement regulations, 15 DCMR § 2200 *et. seq.* (2000).

B.5 Written or Oral Discussions

Section 2202.12 of the Commission's procurement regulations permits the Contracting Officer to conduct oral discussions with Offerors that tender submissions to expedite the proposal evaluation process.

B.5.1. Award Without Discussions

In order to meet the award schedule, the Commission will make every effort to award the prospective contract without either written or oral discussions. Therefore, each Offeror is advised that it should submit a complete and thorough submission that is fully compliant with the instructions in this RFP.

B.5.2. Written or Oral Discussions

If the Contracting Officer elects to hold discussions with Offerors, then a competitive range will be established based on the Evaluation Criteria set forth this RFP. Upon completion of discussions, the Contracting Officer will issue to all

Offerors in the competitive range a request for best and final offers. After receipt of best and final offers, the Contracting Officer will not reopen discussions unless it is clearly in the best interest of the Commission to do so.

B.6 Retention of Submissions

All submissions shall be retained by the Commission and therefore shall not be returned to Offerors.

B.7 Examination of Submissions

Offerors are expected to examine the requirements of all instructions (including all amendments, addenda, attachments and exhibits) in this RFP. Failure to do so shall be at the sole risk of the Offeror and may result in disqualification.

B.8 Late Submissions: Modifications

Any submission or best and final offer received at the office designated in this RFP after the exact time specified for receipt shall not be considered. Any modification of a submission, including a modification resulting from the Contracting Officer's request for best and final offers, is subject to the same conditions as in Section C of this Attachment.

The only acceptable evidence to establish the time of receipt at the Commission is the time-date stamp of the Commission on the submission cover page or other documentary evidence of receipt maintained by the Commission. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this RFP to the contrary, a late modification of an otherwise successful submission that makes the terms more favorable to the Commission may be considered at any time it is received and may be accepted.

Submissions shall be irrevocable and remain in full force and effect for a period not less than 120 days after receipt of submissions.

B.9 No Compensation for Preparation of Submissions

The Commission shall not bear or assume any financial obligation or liability regarding the preparation of any submissions in response to this RFP or prepared in connection therewith, including but not limited to any submissions, statements, reports, data, information, materials or other documents or items.

ATTACHMENT B

(FORM OF OFFER LETTER)
(Contractor's Letterhead)

(Insert Date)

District of Columbia Public Service Commission
1325 G Street, NW, 8th Floor
Washington, DC 20005

Attn: Jesse Clay
Deputy Executive Director for Administration

Reference: Request for Proposals (RFP) No. PSC-18-08, *Formal Case No. 1130, In the Matter of the Investigation into Modernizing the Energy Delivery System for Increased Sustainability* ("MEDSIS")

Dear Dr. Clay:

On behalf of [INSERT NAME OF OFFEROR] (the "Offeror"), I am pleased to submit this proposal in response to the DC Public Service Commission's ("PSC") Request for Proposal (the "RFP") for a Technical Consultant to Advise the Commission on *Formal Case No. 1130, In the Matter of the Investigation into Modernizing the Energy Delivery System for Increased Sustainability* ("MEDSIS")

(The Offeror) has reviewed the RFP and the attachments thereto, any addenda thereto (collectively, the "Proposal Documents"), and has conducted such due diligence and analysis as (the Offeror), in its sole judgment, has deemed necessary in order to submit its Proposal in response to the RFP. (Collectively, the Proposal, Unit Prices, and Total Estimated Prices are referred to as the "Offeror's Proposal".)

The Offeror's Proposal price is as follows:

Total Phase 1 + Phase 2	\$ _____
Add Alternate for Technical Assessment	\$ _____
Total Estimated Price:	\$ _____

SCHEDULE OF UNIT PRICING

Offerors shall submit hourly rates for its proposed key personnel. These hourly rates shall be valid for the duration of the Contract and will be the basis for pricing additional services as needed in relation to the scope of work described in RFP-18-08.

Phase 1: Stakeholder Engagement (without Technical Assessment Add Alternate)			
Labor Category	Hourly Rate	Estimated Number of Hours	Total

Total Estimated Price \$ _____

Phase 2: Working Group Process			
Labor Category	Hourly Rate	Estimated Number of Hours	Total

Total Estimated Price \$ _____

Add Alternate

Phase 1: Stakeholder Engagement and System Assessment			
Labor Category	Hourly Rate	Estimated Number of Hours	Total

Total Estimated Price \$ _____

The Offeror acknowledges and understands that this is a time and materials contract with unit prices that will remain fixed throughout the term of the contract and, except for reimbursable expenses, are intended to be Offeror's sole compensation for work under the contract. "Reimbursable Expenses" means reasonable out-of-pocket expenses for meals, taxis, long distance telephone, facsimile, and messenger that are required in the performance of the contracted work. The Offeror further acknowledges and understands that the cost of reimbursable expenses shall be without markup and within the limits of the US Government, General Services Administration rates and per diems. The Commission shall reimburse Contractor for documented Reimbursable Expenses billed promptly and presented in reasonable detail and previously approved by the Contract Administrator.

The Offeror's Proposal is based on and subject to the following conditions:

1. The Offeror agrees to hold its proposal open for a period of at least one hundred twenty (120) days after the RFP closing date.
2. Assuming the Offeror is selected by the Commission and subject only to the changes requested in paragraph 5, the Offeror agrees to enter into a contract with the Commission on the terms and conditions described in the Proposal Documents within ten (10) days of the notice of the award.
3. Both the Offeror and the undersigned represent and warrant that the undersigned has the full legal authority to submit this Proposal form and bind the Offeror to the terms of the Offeror's proposal. The Offeror further represents and warrants that no further action or approval must be obtained by the Offeror in order to authorize the terms of the Offeror's proposal.
4. The Offeror and its principal team members hereby represent and warrant that they have not: (i) colluded with any other group or person that is submitting a proposal in response

to the RFP in order to fix or set prices; (ii) acted in such a manner so as to discourage any other group or person from submitting a proposal in response to the RFP; or (iii) otherwise engaged in conduct that would violate applicable anti-trust law.

5. This Offer Letter Form and the Offeror's Proposal are being submitted on behalf of [INSERT FULL LEGAL NAME, TYPE OF ORGANIZATION, AND STATE OF FORMATION FOR THE OFFEROR].

Sincerely,

By: _____
Name: _____
Its: _____
Date: _____

ATTACHMENT C

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Personnel who will perform the work described in the RFP shall disclose to the Commission whether they are blood related to the following individuals or have worked for the Commission in the past five (5) years:

Chairman Betty Ann Kane
Commissioner Willie L. Phillips
Commissioner Richard Beverly

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER
OFFICE OF TAX AND REVENUE



TAX CERTIFICATION AFFIDAVIT

THIS AFFIDAVIT IS TO BE COMPLETED ONLY BY THOSE WHO ARE REGISTERED TO CONDUCT BUSINESS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Date: _____

Name of Organization/Entity: _____

Address: _____

Business Telephone _____ No.: _____

Principal Officer: _____

Name: _____ Title: _____

Social Security No.: _____

Federal Identification No.: _____

Contract No.: _____

Unemployment Insurance Account No.: _____

I hereby certify that:

1. I have complied with the applicable tax filing and licensing requirements of the District of Columbia.
2. The following information is true and correct concerning tax compliance for the following taxes for the past five (5) years:

	<u>Current</u>	<u>Not Current</u>	<u>Not Applicable</u>
District: Sales and Use	()	()	()
Employment Withholding	()	()	()
Ballpark Fee	()	()	()
Corporation Franchise	()	()	()
Unincorporated Franchise	()	()	()
Personal Property	()	()	()
Real Property	()	()	()
Individual Income	()	()	()

Tax Certification Affidavit
Page 2

The Office of Tax and Revenue is hereby authorized to verify the above information with the appropriate government authorities. The penalty for making false statements is a fine not to exceed \$5,000.00, imprisonment for not more than 180 days, or both, as prescribed by D.C. Official Code § 47-4106.

This affidavit must be notarized and becomes void if not submitted within 90 days of the date notarized.

Signature of Authorizing Agent

Title

Print Name

Notary: DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ss:

Subscribed and sworn before me this _____ day of _____ Month
and Year

Notary Public: _____

My Commission

Expires: _____



Attachment E
PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM

DC Public Service Commission

Offeror Name: _____

Performance Element (See Description p. 2)	Excellent *	Good	Acceptable	Poor	Unacceptable**
Quality of Services/ Work					
Timeliness of Performance					
Cost Control					
Business Relations					
Customer Satisfaction					

1. Name of Evaluating Organization: _____

2. Name & Title of Evaluator: _____

3. Telephone Number of Evaluator: _____

4. E-mail address of Evaluator: _____

5. Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date: _____

6. Describe type of service received: _____

7. Contract Number _____ Contract Amount _____

8. Contract Period of Performance _____

*Remarks on Excellent Performance: Provide data supporting this observation.
(Continue on separate sheet if needed)

** Remarks on Unacceptable Performance: Provide data supporting this observation.
(Continue on separate sheet if needed)

RATING GUIDELINES

Summarize Contractor performance in each of the rating areas. Assign each area a rating of 0 (Unacceptable), 1 (Poor), 2 (Acceptable), 3 (Good), 4(Excellent), or ++ (Plus). Use the following instructions as guidance in making these evaluations.

	Quality Product/Service -Compliance with contract requirements -Accuracy of reports -Appropriateness of personnel -Technical excellence	Cost Control -Within budget (over/ under target costs) -Current, accurate, and complete billings -Relationship of negated costs to actual -Cost efficiencies -Change order issue	Timeless of Performance -Meet Interim milestones -Reliable -Responsive to technical directions -Completed on time, including wrap-up and contract administration -No liquidated damages assessed	Business Relations -Effective management -Businesslike correspondence -Responsive to contract requirements -Prompt notification of contract problems -Reasonable/cooperative -Flexible -Pro-active -effective contractor recommended solutions -Effective snail/small disadvantaged business Subcontracting program
0. Zero	Nonconformances are comprises the achievement of contract requirements, despite use of Agency resources	Cost issues are comprising performance of contract requirements.	Delays are comprising the achievement of contract requirements, Despite use of Agency resources.	Response to inquiries, technical/ service/administrative issues is not effective and responsive.
1, Unacceptable	Nonconformances require major Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Cost issues require major Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Delays require major Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	response to inquiries, technical/ service/administrative issues is marginally effective and responsive.
2. Poor	Nonconformance require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Costs issues require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Delays require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Responses to inquiries, technical/ service/administrative issues is somewhat effective and responsive.
3. Acceptable	Nonconformances do not impact achievement of contract requirements.	Cost issues do not impact achievement of contract requirements.	Delays do not impact achievement of contract requirements.	Responses to inquires, technical/ service/administrative issues is usually effective and responsive.
4. Good	There are no quality problems.	There are no cost issues.	There are not delays.	Responses to inquiries, technical/ service/administrative issues is effective and responsive,
5. Excellent	The contractor has demonstrated an exceptional performance level in some or all of the above categories.			

ATTACHMENT F

LIST OF REPORTS TO CONSIDER IN SYSTEM ASSESSMENT DETERMINATION

A list of formal case filings that can be reviewed to assist Contractors in formulating their responses to this RFP as they pertain to determining the estimated cost related to and necessary scheduling of conducting a system assessment, if determined necessary in Phase 1, is provided below. This list is All non-confidential case filings are accessible through the Commission's e-docket system at <https://edocket.dcpsec.org/public/search>. In the "Case Number" field type the appropriate case as FCXXXX and then click "Search."

- RM9 Community Renewable Energy Facilities Report (1/9/18)
<https://edocket.dcpsec.org/public/search/details/rm9/41>
- FC 1130 MEDSIS Staff Report (1/25/17)
<https://edocket.dcpsec.org/public/search/details/fc1130/88>
- FC 1130 MEDSIS Vision Statement (2/14/18)
<https://edocket.dcpsec.org/public/search/details/fc1130/231>
- FC 1130 MEDSIS DOEE Non-wires Alternative Study (1/29/18)
<https://edocket.dcpsec.org/public/search/details/fc1130/223>
- FC 1150 Direct Testimony on Load Forecasting (Hall) and Construction Program Report (Clark and Verner) (12/19/17)
<https://edocket.dcpsec.org/public/search/details/fc1150/1>
- FC 1139 Direct Testimony on Construction Program Report (Verner) (6/30/16)
<https://edocket.dcpsec.org/public/search/details/fc1139/1>
- FC 1139 Load Forecasting Methodology Technical Conference Report (11/15/17)
<https://edocket.dcpsec.org/public/search/details/fc1139/318>
- FC 1050 Hosting Capacity Map
<https://www.pepco.com/MyAccount/MyService/Pages/DC/HostingCapacityMap.aspx>
- FC 1050 Restricted Circuit Map
<https://www.pepco.com/MyAccount/MyService/Pages/DC/RestrictedCircuitMap.aspx>

- FC 1050 Cross-Border Feeder Map
<https://www.pepco.com/MyAccount/MyService/Pages/DC/CrossBorderFeederMap.aspx>
- FC 1050 Annual Interconnection Report (3/31/17)
<https://edocket.dcpsec.org/public/search/details/fc1050/152>
- FC 1086 Direct Load Control Program Report (9/25/17)
<https://edocket.dcpsec.org/public/search/details/fc1086/124>
- FC 1137 Supplemental Direct Testimony on 10-year Gas Distribution Program (Huey) (5/2/16)
<https://edocket.dcpsec.org/public/search/details/fc1137/47>
- FC 1143 Pepco's EV Demand Management Program Proposal (4/21/17)
<https://edocket.dcpsec.org/public/search/details/fc1143/1>
- PEPENMR Monthly Market Monitoring Report (2/14/18)
<https://edocket.dcpsec.org/public/search/details/pepenmr/3>
- RPSR Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard Report (5/1/17)
<https://edocket.dcpsec.org/public/search/details/rpsr/45>
- Bi-Annual Report on Fuel Mix (7/3/17)
<https://dcpsec.org/Orders-and-Regulations/PSC-Reports-to-the-DC-Council/Bi-Annual-Report-on-Fuel-Mix.aspx>
- Monthly Update of Solar Generator Certification
<https://www.dcpsec.org/Utility-Information/Electric/Renewables/Renewable-Energy-Portfolio-Standard-Program/Monthly-Update-of-Solar-Generator-Certification.aspx>
- Monthly Commodity Natural Gas Market Share Reports
<https://www.dcpsec.org/Utility-Information/Natural-Gas/Historical-Analytical-Information-for-Natural-Gas/Commodity-Natural-Gas-Market-Share-Tables.aspx>