



Jack E. Jirak  
Associate General Counsel

Mailing Address:  
NCRH 20 / P.O. Box 1551  
Raleigh, NC 27602

o: 919.546.3257  
f: 919.546.2694

jack.jirak@duke-energy.com

July 23, 2019

**VIA ELECTRONIC FILING**

Ms. M. Lynn Jarvis  
Chief Clerk  
North Carolina Utilities Commission  
4325 Mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27699-4300

**RE: Updated CPRE Tranche 1 Final Independent Administrator Report  
Docket Nos. E-2, Sub 1159 and E-7, Sub 1156**

Dear Ms. Jarvis:

On July 18, 2019, Duke Energy Progress, LLC (“DEP”) and Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (“DEC” and together with DEP, “Duke” or the “Companies”) submitted the final report regarding the results of the Tranche 1 Competitive Procurement of Renewable Energy (“CPRE”) Request for Proposals (“RFP”) in accordance with the North Carolina Utilities Commission’s (“Commission”) June 25, 2018 Order Denying Joint Motion, Approving Pro Forma PPA, and Providing Other Relief in Docket Nos. E-2, Sub 1159 and E-7, Sub 1156 (“Order”).


In accordance with the Order<sup>1</sup> and the terms of the CPRE Power Purchase Agreement, the Companies and the IA maintained the confidentiality of the winning bidders in the Final Report. However, certain of the winning bidders had already publicly self-disclosed their status as winning bidders (which decision was fully within the discretion of each winning bidder) and, subsequent to its July 18, 2019 filing, the Companies were able to obtain the consent of the remaining winning bidders to allow for the public disclosure of such projects. Therefore, the Company is hereby re-submitting the Final Report with the identities of the winning bidders no longer designated as confidential.

---

<sup>1</sup> “Therefore, the Commission will require Duke to file in these dockets an additional report on the results of the Tranche 1 CPRE RFP Solicitation, no later than 10 days after the conclusion of the contracting period for the Tranche 1 CPRE RFP Solicitation...Duke shall work with the Independent Administrator to produce this report within the construct of the Evaluation Team framework so that confidentiality of market participants is maintained, where applicable.” Order at 8.

Please do not hesitate to let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jack Jirak". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "J" and "J".


Jack E. Jirak

cc: Parties of Record

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that a copy of Duke Energy Progress, LLC's and Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC's Updated CPRE Tranche 1 Final Independent Administrator Report, in Docket Nos. E-2, Sub 1159 and E-7, Sub 1156, has been served by electronic mail, hand delivery or by depositing a copy in the United States mail, postage prepaid to parties of record.

This the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of July, 2019.



---

Jack E. Jirak  
Associate General Counsel  
Duke Energy Corporation  
P.O. Box 1551/NCRH 20  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602  
(919) 546-3257  
[Jack.jirak@duke-energy.com](mailto:Jack.jirak@duke-energy.com)



**DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC  
DUKE ENERGY PROGRESS, LLC**

**FINAL REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT ADMINISTRATOR**

**RE:**

**DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS (DEC)**

Competitive Procurement of Renewable Energy Program (CPRE)  
Request for Proposal (RFP) – 600 MW

**DUKE ENERGY PROGRESS (DEP)**

Competitive Procurement of Renewable Energy Program (CPRE)  
Request for Proposals (RFP) – 80 MW

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR  
THE COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT OF RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAM  
TRANCHE 1**

---

**July 18, 2019**

**ACCION GROUP, LLC**  
244 North Main Street  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301  
Telephone: 603-229-1644  
Fax: 603-225-4923  
Email: [advisors@acciongroup.com](mailto:advisors@acciongroup.com)  
[www.acciongroup.com](http://www.acciongroup.com)

<b>I.</b>	<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>LESSONS LEARNED FROM TRANCHE 1 .....</b>	<b>3</b>
	A. TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION EVALUATION PROCESS.....	3
	B. DOCUMENTS .....	4
	C. PROPOSAL SECURITY .....	5
	D. UTILITY SELF-DEVELOPED PROPOSALS .....	5
	E. ASSET ACQUISITION.....	6
	F. TRANSMISSION QUEUE ISSUES.....	6
	G. PROCESS RECOMMENDATIONS.....	7
<b>III.</b>	<b>INDEPENDENT ADMINISTRATOR.....</b>	<b>8</b>
	A. ABOUT THE IA .....	8
	B. THE IA'S ROLE IN THE RFP .....	9
<b>IV.</b>	<b>WEBSITE.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>OVERVIEW OF TRANCHE 1 CPRE PROPOSAL PROCESS.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>PRE-PROPOSAL SUBMISSION ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>PROPOSAL SUBMISSION .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>EVALUATION MODEL .....</b>	<b>24</b>
	A. OVERVIEW .....	24
	B. REQUIRED INPUT DATA .....	24
	C. EVALUATION MODEL PROCESSING .....	25
<b>IX.</b>	<b>EVALUATION .....</b>	<b>26</b>
	A. OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION PROCESS.....	26
	B. PRICE SCORING SHEETS .....	27
	C. EVALUATION TEAMS .....	27
	D. CURE PROCESS.....	27
<b>X.</b>	<b>STEP 1 EVALUATION PROCESS.....</b>	<b>29</b>
	A. OUTLINE OF PROCESS .....	29
	B. INITIAL TIER RANKING.....	30
	C. PROPOSAL SECURITY .....	32
<b>XI.</b>	<b>STEP 2 EVALUATION PROCESS - T&amp;D OVERVIEW.....</b>	<b>34</b>
	A. ACTIVITY PRIOR TO PROPOSAL SUBMISSION.....	34
	B. FLOW CHART OF STEP 2 .....	37
	C. ANALYSIS REPORT FORMAT .....	37
	D. COMMUNICATION DOCUMENTATION.....	37
	E. LATE STAGE PROJECTS .....	38
	F. INTERCONNECTION VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION .....	38
	G. STEP 2 PROCESS .....	40
	H. THRESHOLD COST ESTIMATES .....	41
	I. MEGAWATT REDUCTIONS AVAILABLE.....	41
	J. BASE CASE FORMULATION .....	41
	K. COST ANALYSIS COMPLETED .....	43
	L. VERIFICATION OF COST ANALYSIS RESULTS.....	46
	M. STEP 2 PROCESS CONCLUSIONS.....	49
<b>XII.</b>	<b>SUBJECT MATTER AREAS.....</b>	<b>50</b>

- A. LEGAL TEAM REVIEW ..... 50
- B. FINANCIAL TEAM REVIEW ..... 50
- C. PROJECT SUFFICIENCY TEAM REVIEW ..... 51
- XIII. ACQUISITION PROCESS AUDIT..... 52**
  - A. OVERVIEW ..... 52
  - B. AUDIT OBJECTIVE..... 53
  - C. THE AUDIT ..... 53
  - D. AUDIT CONTRACT REVIEW ..... 59
  - E. ACQUISITION AUDIT CONCLUSIONS ..... 59
- XIV. FINALISTS ..... 60**
- XV. CONCLUSIONS..... 61**
- APPENDIX A ..... 1**
- APPENDIX B ..... 2**
- APPENDIX C ..... 8**
- ATTACHMENT 1 ..... 1**

**FINAL REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT ADMINISTRATOR  
RE: DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC; DUKE ENERGY PROGRESS, LLC  
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR  
THE COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT OF RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAM  
TRANCHE 1**

**July 18, 2019**

**I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Accion Group, LLC (“Accion”) serves as the Independent Administrator (“IA”) of the Competitive Procurement of Renewable Energy (“CPRE”) program and began the assignment in January 2018. The IA participated in all aspects of the program, from preparing the draft and final Request for Proposal (“RFP”) documents through the final evaluation of all submitted Proposals. This is the IA’s final report concerning Tranche 1 of the CPRE program. This report provides an overview of Tranche 1 with detailed explanation of the processes and procedures that were employed. The IA also provides recommendations for improvements in Tranche 2.

Figure 1 presents a summary of the Tranche 1 Results.

**Figure 1**

	<b>DEC</b>	<b>DEP</b>
MW Procured	<b>465.50</b>	<b>85.72</b>
Average price/MWh	<b>\$37.94</b>	<b>\$38.30</b>
Nominal Savings over 20 years	<b>\$228.00 Million</b>	<b>\$33.17 Million</b>

Currently, the CPRE Program Plan approved by the Commission projects the need for three tranches of CPRE solicitations to be completed within the time frame contemplated by HB 589. Tranche 1 was the “beta” for the program and initiated the processes and procedures of CPRE to comply with the Rules established by the North Carolina Utilities Commission (“NCUC”) and refine the program for future Tranches. As such, the IA believes Tranche 1 was a success.

The CPRE program is designed to procure 2,600 MW <sup>1</sup> of new renewable resources over a 45-month period provided those purchases are below Duke Energy’s respective forecasted avoided cost calculated over a twenty-year term either through the Power Purchase Agreement (“PPA” or “RPPA”) or from resources to be owned by Duke. Tranche 1 sought 600 MW of qualifying renewable resources for Duke Energy Carolinas (“DEC”) and 80 MW for Duke Energy Progress (“DEP”); collectively DEP and DEC are referred to as the “Duke Companies” or “Company” in this report. The Duke Companies and its affiliates are permitted to participate in the CPRE program with projects to be constructed or acquired by

<sup>1</sup> As specified in the currently effective CPRE Program Plan, the revised procurement target is now 1,460 - 1,960 MW due to the increase of the Transition MW.

the Company to serve the goals of the CPRE program. Proposals from the Duke Companies were made by the DEP/DEC Proposal Team (“DEP/DEC Team”).<sup>2</sup>

The IA provided the web-based platform (“Website”) for proposals submitted to DEC, DEP, and Asset Acquisition (“AA”) proposals. The unregulated affiliate of the Duke Companies, Duke Energy Renewables (“DER”), participated in the same manner as other Market Participants (“MPs”). The IA Website maintained three separate and secure “Silos” for each of the three solicitations; all data related to these solicitations has been maintained by the IA on secure servers.

Proposals were received through October 9, 2018, when the Proposal submission period closed.<sup>3</sup> At that time, the ability for MPs to adjust their Proposal forms was terminated, including the ability to submit additional Proposals.

The IA received a robust number of Proposals and MWs in each Silo. Proposals included a balanced representation from North Carolina and South Carolina and ranged in size from seven to 80 MW AC of generating capacity in both DEC and DEP; 80 MW was the maximum size that could be submitted. The majority of Proposals would require transmission level service. There were also Proposals for projects that would interconnect to the Duke system at the distribution level. The Website functioned as desired in that it allowed a wide variance of Proposals to be submitted.

While MPs had the ability to provide renewable energy from certain technologies,<sup>4</sup> the IA received proposals for only solar photovoltaic (“PV”) generation. Four of these projects proposed storage integration. The IA conducted the evaluation of Proposals as required for CPRE, that is with a preliminary evaluation of all Proposals in Step 1, followed by a Step 2 cost analysis study of the most competitive Proposals by the T&D Evaluation team, and a final step of the evaluation completed by the IA by imputing system impact costs to Proposals and conducting another iterative evaluation ranking of Proposals.

The Website remained the host of all CPRE activities through the Step 2 evaluation process and until each PPA was executed on July 8, 2019 and Performance Assurance security was provided. The IA retained all submissions by the MPs and all exchanges between the IA and MPs, as well as exchanges between individual MPs and members of the Duke Evaluation Team after the IA identified the Proposals selected for PPAs. Prior to the selection of finalists, the IA used the Message Board to communicate project-specific questions and comments with MPs, after consultation with the Duke Evaluation Team.

Before evaluating Proposals, the IA reviewed all Proposals submitted on the DEC and DEP Silos and completed a summary of each one. Each summary captured the core information provided with each Proposal and requested that the MP review and respond to the IA either confirming the accuracy of the information or identifying discrepancies. The Step 1 evaluation ranked Proposals into an initial

<sup>2</sup> Members of the DEP/DEC Team were subject to the Code of Conduct separation protocols, which isolated them from the Duke Evaluation Team.

<sup>3</sup> To avoid all inferences of bias, Proposals for projects to be originated by Duke and submitted by the DEP/DEC Team or DER were required to be submitted no later than October 8, 2018. Proposals by the DEP/DEC Team for projects selected for acquisition as part of CPRE were submitted on November 16, 2018.

<sup>4</sup> Tranche 1 accepted renewable energy resources as identified in G.S. 62-133.8(a)(8), with the exception of wind, swine, and poultry waste powered facilities.

Competitive Tier (“Competitive Tier”), Competitive Tier Reserve (“Competitive Tier Reserve” or “Reserve List”), and released Proposals.

On April 9, 2019, the IA completed the selection process, and final status notifications were sent to MPs for each Proposal. At that time, the IA created a separate message board for exchanges between the MPs of the Finalist Proposals (“Finalist MPs”) and the appropriate Duke Personnel. Also, at that time, the same Duke Personnel were given access to the Proposal Books of the Finalist Proposals for review.

Subsequent to the notification of the parties representing winning proposals, two selected winning proposals chose to not proceed, one each in DEC and DEP. In DEC, there were no other active proposals remaining after Step 2, so the final results for Tranche 1 in DEC reflect the impact of this project withdrawing prior to signing the PPA. In DEP, the IA reached out to the MP with the next most competitive Proposal and substantially replaced the MWs of the withdrawn Proposal by the July 8, 2019 deadline.<sup>5</sup>

Attachment 1 sets forth the identity of the winning Proposals and those MPs that sponsored a winning Proposal but elected to withdraw.

The IA believes the CPRE Tranche 1 solicitation was conducted fairly and all MPs were given equal access to all information at the same time. The evaluation of Proposals was completed without bias towards or against any qualifying technology or participant. Further, the separation protocols that isolated Proposals from Duke Company personnel, including the Duke Evaluation Team, was strictly enforced. While the T&D Evaluation team had, out of necessity, the identity of projects as part of the Step 2 review, the IA is unaware of any instance where Duke personnel had access to project-identifying information from Proposals prior to the completion the CPRE Step 2 and the release of data to the Duke Evaluation Team.<sup>6</sup>

## II. LESSONS LEARNED FROM TRANCHE 1

As the “beta test” of the CPRE Program, the IA is pleased with the accomplishments and success of Tranche 1. Below are observations and suggestions of the IA drawn from the Tranche 1 experience. The IA offers these suggestions as ways to improve the program for Tranche 2.

### A. TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION EVALUATION PROCESS

The basis for these recommendations is discussed in the body of this report and summarized here:

1. There is a need for the Tranche 2 T&D system upgrade “base case” to better represent projects that will receive transmission and distribution services. The IA will work with the T&D Evaluation team to propose threshold standards for projects to be included in the base case. The Proposal will include a focus on upgrade cost and duration of necessary construction.

<sup>5</sup> The withdrawal in DEP occurred less than two weeks before the deadline for completing PPAs.

<sup>6</sup> There were three instances when MPs contacted members of the Duke Evaluation Team. Each time the Duke personnel declined to discuss the CPRE program and notified the IA.

2. Better locational guidance should reflect the commitment of transmission capacity to serve the successful CPRE Tranche 1 projects.
3. The Tranche 2 T&D system upgrade “base case” analysis should:
  - Exclude each project proposed and eliminated in Tranche 1 after it was established that upgrade costs would result in the project being well above avoided cost.
  - Only include the largest interconnection request when a project has multiple queue positions of differing sizes.
4. The IA should be included in all discussions with MPs until PPAs are signed in order to confirm the discussions are consistent with representations in Proposals concerning interconnection.
5. Duke Interconnection Account Managers should be included more on the T&D Evaluation team and actively engage in the Proposal analysis process, subject to following the appropriate communication protocols.
6. The IA should maintain a central ledger showing Proposal activity and current evaluation status. This is to be shared among all T&D Evaluation personnel and would be updated on a regular schedule.
7. Incorporate into the standard Proposal analysis document a more explicit discussion of risk and construction requirements needed to meet commercial operating dates.
8. Include reactive analysis as a standard part of the T&D system upgrade cost analysis process.

## **B. DOCUMENTS**

Project documents were required as part of the due diligence review of project viability and state of completion. The goal of permitting so-called “shovel ready” projects to move forward could only be met by MPs confirming their projects were more than conceptual. A surprising number of Proposals were submitted with incomplete documents, including such basic items as proof of site control. During Tranche 2, the IA intends to continue to use the cure period to provide MPs the opportunity to meet their burden of proof with appropriate project documentation, rather than rejecting Proposals without the opportunity to correct misunderstandings and complete forms. While the cure period will continue to be limited to the Step 1 period, the response requirement for cures will be restricted.

The IA required identification of the transmission path from the project to the proposed Point of Interconnection (“POI”). A number of MPs failed to provide this information with their Proposals and were permitted to rectify the omissions during the cure period. The IA will use the pre-proposal period to impress upon MPs the need to identify each tract of land that would be crossed to reach the POI along with proof of site control of the path for the term of the PPA.

The Tranche 2 proposal form will include an acknowledgement that the MP is responsible for the accuracy of all documents. The IA is hopeful this will encourage MPs to be more attentive when submitting Proposals, so the IA need not require replacement documents, thus permitting the economic evaluation to occur more promptly.

Some MPs were unaware of which permits would be required for their project. The Tranche 2 Proposal form should include a form identifying the permits that could be required, and a “check off” identifying those applicable to the project.

Proof of Title Insurance was required as a tool to confirm site control. Few MPs provided the documentation. The IA is exploring additional ways to confirm sufficient site control of project sites and the transmission path.

Based on the experience in Tranche 1, the IA recommends the following requirements for documents to provide details on the generating facility design:

1. The Tranche 2 RFP and Proposal Form should include a requirement for MPs to provide the PV Syst input/output parameters and related calculations/work papers supporting the proposal's 8760 energy production profile. Had this been required in Tranche 1, some or all of the miscommunications between the IA team and certain MPs would have been avoided.
2. A required document entitled “Generating Facility Description” should describe or include: a) major structures related to the production of electricity; b) key equipment components (e.g., solar PV modules, inverters, transformers, energy storage devices if applicable); c) model numbers, nameplate capacities, spec sheets etc., as applicable; and d) transmission lines and electrical equipment leading to the POI with the existing electric grid. This facility description should be of sufficient accuracy and completeness that it can be inserted as an exhibit into a PPA to represent the exact facility that will be constructed and operated to meet the PPA terms and conditions.

### **C. PROPOSAL SECURITY**

The need for Proposal security was confirmed in Tranche 1. At the same time, the process can be improved by the IA giving MPs more advanced notice of when Proposal security will be due, rather than the seven-day notice provided in Tranche 1. This was especially challenging for MPs during the iterative process of Step 2 with projects on the Competitive Tier Reserve who were subsequently moved to the Primary Competitive Tier after the initial completion of Step 1.

The IA proposes to provide a “two-step” approach whereby the IA will provide the MP with a preliminary notice that a project is under review and that a notice that Proposal security is required will be forwarded within one week.

### **D. UTILITY SELF-DEVELOPED PROPOSALS**

As outlined in the IA’s role in Section III, an important part of the IA’s role is to ensure equitable treatment of all Proposals, including both third party Proposals and utility self-developed Proposals. Specifically, the NCUC established items (iv), (viii), and (ix) as the IA’s responsibilities:

- (iv) Develop and publish the CPRE Program Methodology that shall ensure equitable review between an electric public utility’s Self-developed Proposal(s) as addressed in subsection (f)(2)(iv) and proposals offered by third-party market participants.

(viii) Evaluate the electric public utility's Self-developed Proposals.

(ix) Provide an independent certification to the Commission in the CPRE Compliance Report that all electric public utility and third-party proposals were evaluated under the published CPRE Program methodology and that all proposals were treated equitably through the CPRE RFP Solicitation(s).

Based on the experience in Tranche 1, the IA recommends revising the Proposal security requirements for the DEP/DEC Team. Proposal security or some functional equivalent should be required in the case of both Duke self-developed projects and Asset Acquisition projects that the DEP/DEC team elects to sponsor. The IA will work with Duke to develop an appropriate structure for use in Tranche 2, which will be provided to the NCUC for consideration.

In Tranche 1, two winning Proposals withdrew after being selected as finalists after the close of Step 2. One Proposal was from a third-party MP and the other was from an Asset Acquisition Proposal sponsored by the DEP/DEC Team. The impact of the third-party MP withdrawing late in the process was mitigated by the existence of the non-refundable Proposal security.<sup>7</sup> The utility's Asset Acquisition winning Proposal that withdrew did not have Proposal security<sup>8</sup> and the related project developer was not obligated to provide comparable security in the event of withdrawal. In effect, the DEP/DEC Team and the developer had a free option to withdraw at any time, which the IA believes was an unanticipated result.<sup>9</sup> This issue arose during the final stages of the post-selection period, so fully developed recommendations for preventing this from reoccurring are being developed by the IA and Duke personnel and will be provided during the Tranche 2 formative stage. The recommendations will address ways to have both all Duke Proposals and developers of Asset Acquisition projects held to the same performance standards as MPs offering PPA Proposals. This issue is discussed in more detail later this report.

#### **E. ASSET ACQUISITION**

The IA is working with Duke to develop and clarify expectations for processing of Asset Acquisition proposals received from Market Participants to ensure a fair and transparent process and facilitate concurrent and post-review by the IA. This includes the communications through the website and other means with MPs, processing of proposals within Duke, and the process utilized by Duke to rank and select proposals for possible submission as Asset Acquisitions.

The Tranche 2 RFP should provide clear expectations/requirements for agreement between Duke and a Market Participant to in order for Duke to submit an Asset Acquisition proposal. For instance, a Letter of Intent covering principal terms and conditions should be required.

#### **F. TRANSMISSION QUEUE ISSUES**

After Proposals were received in Tranche 1, the IA and Duke T&D personnel worked to confirm the eligibility of each project. It soon became clear that the queue numbering system created an

<sup>7</sup> As of the date of this report, the Proposal security payment had not been received.

<sup>8</sup> The RFP expressly waived the Proposal security requirement for utility self-developed Proposals.

<sup>9</sup> The reasoning behind the RFP waiver of Proposal security from the DEP/DEC team related to the fact that DEP/DEC would be unable to obtain a letter of credit in which DEP/DEC was both the beneficiary and applicant/obligor.

unnecessary challenge due to numerous different queue numbering methods. To illustrate this problem, the following are a list of possible queue numbers attached to a project: the queue number assigned by Duke Transmission, the queue number for projects registered with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”), the queue numbering for North Carolina, the queue numbering used in South Carolina, and, in some instances, unique queue numbers assigned by Duke Account Managers.

To avoid future confusion, the IA will work with Duke to develop a unified project documentation system for Tranche 2 that will allow the IA to more efficiently assess and evaluate Proposals. This review will include developing a form to compare and confirm the projects associated with queue numbers as presented by MPs and assign one reference number to be used in the Step 2 process. For Tranche 2, the IA and the T&D team will reconcile in a sequential way all queue numbering, based on date of the MP requesting interconnection.

## **G. PROCESS RECOMMENDATIONS**

The IA makes the following recommendations for Tranche 2, based on the Tranche 1 experience:

### **1. RFP Document**

The IA recommends the following three general changes to the RFP:

- a. Add definitions of the Step 1 ranking classifications; “Primary Competitive Tier,” “Competitive Tier Reserve,” and “Release List” in Section F on Proposal security (possibly in Section F on Proposal security).
- b. Change the definition of the Proposal security calculation to match the term “Generating Capacity MW AC” supplied in the Proposal Forms.
- c. Change some of the “non-economic criteria” in Appendix F to pass / fail when appropriate, such as Credit Worthiness to remove risk to Duke through the posting of Proposal security.

### **2. Proposal Form**

The IA has the following recommendations to the Proposal Form:

- a. Agree within Duke on a standard term to represent the output capacity for the term “Generating Capacity” to avoid confusion. Having all the terms such as Generating Capacity MW AC, Total DC Capacity [MW], Contract Capacity [MW], Installed Inverter Capacity [MW], and Max Design Capacity MW AC may be unnecessary.
- b. If the term “Insta DC Rating [kWpDC]” is needed in future Proposal Forms, change the unit from kW to MW.
- c. Remove “Decrement” from the calculated prices since the price that the bidder will be paid is not a decrement to the bidder.
- d. Explicitly list the Proposal security calculation on the Proposal Form.
- e. Investigate why multiple bidders had trouble selecting the correct drop-down box for Technology.

- f. Investigate using a standard format for all queue numbers.

### 3. Evaluation Process

The IA offers the following recommendations to the Evaluation Process:

- a. Update guidance for MPs regarding area of transmission congestion.
- b. Duke T&D Account Managers should be included in T&D Evaluation team and included in the Proposal analysis process, and thereby will have access to the ranking knowledge earlier in the review process.
- c. The IA should maintain a central ledger showing Step 2 activity and status of each proposal review. This would be shared among all T&D Evaluation team members and would be updated on a regular basis.
- d. Create a better way of understanding construction timing; a standard approach to documenting the likely time constraints would be helpful. A table such as Figure 2 should be inserted in each standard cost analysis document.

Figure 2

<u>COD Risk Due to Transmission?</u>	<u>Earliest Feasible COD</u>
Moderate	To meet a COD of 1/7/2021, this Proposal would need to provide notice to proceed by 01/1/2020. A typical interconnection study process is approximately 1 year. Only after the study process can notice to proceed be issued. Additionally, this Proposal requires coordination with SCEG which could impact the feasibility of COD.

## III. INDEPENDENT ADMINISTRATOR

### A. ABOUT THE IA

With an average of more than thirty-five years of in-depth experience in electric, gas, water, and renewable utilities, Accion Group's diverse consortium of consultants provides insightful, candid, and practical advice to the utility industry and their associated government regulatory bodies. Headquartered in Concord, New Hampshire and consulting affiliates nationwide, Accion's specialties range from competitive procurement and utility management to construction monitoring and nuclear decommissioning.

Since its incorporation in 2001, Accion has been routinely involved in high-profile consulting engagements, thus securing a reputation as one of the premier firms providing independent review of utility procurement practices. Accion has served as Independent Administrator, Independent Evaluator, Independent Monitor, or Independent Observer to state commissions on competitive solicitations in major markets including California, Hawaii, Georgia, Colorado, Montana, Oregon, Florida, the Carolinas, and Arizona. Accion Group has also assisted utilities in the preparation for, and the conduct of, power supply solicitations in Maryland, Massachusetts, and Nevada. Having reviewed Proposals for generation

by renewable sources (including wind, solar, bio-mass, wave action, storage, low-head hydroelectric, geothermal, and methane capture), distributed generation with storage, and the construction of as well as facilities using nuclear power, natural gas, and coal fuels, our consultants are well-versed in the subtleties of utility procurement practices. Accion Group's ultimate goal as IA is the same as the purchasing utility and state regulators: ensuring the solicitation obtains the best deal possible for ratepayers, given current market and regulatory conditions in terms of both price and non-price factors.

## **B. THE IA'S ROLE IN THE RFP**

As IA, Accion conducted Tranche 1 on a website custom made for the purpose. The IA designed and implemented the evaluation of CPRE Tranche 1 Proposals in order to determine those Proposals which offered the greatest value to the ratepayers and recommend those Proposals for contracting with the Companies. The North Carolina Utilities Commission ("NCUC" or "Commission") required the IA perform the following tasks:<sup>10</sup>

- (i) Monitor compliance with CPRE Program requirements.
- (ii) Review and comment on draft CPRE Program filings, plans, and other documents.
- (iii) Facilitate and monitor permissible communications between the electric public utilities' Evaluation Team and other participants in the CPRE RFP solicitations.
- (iv) Develop and publish the CPRE Program Methodology that shall ensure equitable review between an electric public utility's DEP/DEC Proposal(s) as addressed in subsection (f)(2)(iv) and proposals offered by third-party market participants.
- (v) Receive and transmit proposals.
- (vi) Independently evaluate the proposals.
- (vii) Monitor post-proposal negotiations between the electric public utilities' Evaluation Team(s) and participants who submitted winning proposals.
- (viii) Evaluate the electric public utility's DEP/DEC Proposals.
- (ix) Provide an independent certification to the Commission in the CPRE Compliance Report that all electric public utility and third-party proposals were evaluated under the published CPRE Program methodology and that all proposals were treated equitably through the CPRE RFP Solicitation(s).

This report addresses how Accion completed each task and the results of CPRE Tranche 1.

## **IV. WEBSITE**

Accion Group provided the RFP Website ("Website") for CPRE Tranche 1 to operate as a secure platform for the solicitation process including bidding, evaluation, and contracting. Below is an overview of each major feature that was enabled for users within the Duke Tranche 1 CPRE program.

<sup>10</sup> NCUC Docket No. E-100, Sub 150; Rule R8-71(d)(5)

**A. SCHEDULE**

The "Schedule" page displayed the solicitation schedule. Registered users received an email if new events in the schedule were posted or if the schedule was updated.

**B. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The "Announcements" page displayed public announcements regarding the solicitation. When posted, registered users received the announcements via email.

**C. REGISTRATION**

The IA utilized a login registration on the website for purposes of privacy and security. Interested parties were required to register on the website prior to filling out a Proposal form or gaining access to pages such as documents and Q&A.

**D. USER PROFILE**

Allowed users to update their contact information, and turn on or off email notifications when new documents, announcements, or scheduled events occurred.

**E. TUTORIAL**

The IA crafted tutorials in both written and video formats to guide individuals in the use of the website. When an individual registered on the website, an email was sent to them with the written tutorial attached. Both tutorials were posted on the "Tutorials" page on the website and could be accessed prior to registration.

**F. DOCUMENTS**

The "Documents" page displayed all public documents related to Tranche 1. When new documents were posted, registered users received a notification via email. The Documents page was made available after registration.

**G. Q&A**

The "Q&A" page was a forum for registered users to ask non-project specific questions. All questions were anonymous and could be viewed by all registered users. Each question was posted once the IA submitted a response. Users who asked questions received a notification via email when the IA responded to their question. Following the close of the Proposal submission period, the Q&A page was disabled for further questions, though the prior questions and answers remained viewable.

**H. MESSAGES**

Prior to the Proposal submission date, the "Message" page was used only for questions or comments which disclosed confidential project-specific information, and therefore could not be asked via the Q&A forum. This feature was available after registering as a Market Participant ("MP"). After the Proposal period closed, all communications with MPs who submitted Proposals was conducted via a "Finalist Messages" page. This page was used by Duke Evaluation Team members, the IA, and MPs. As with the pre-bid Message Board, these exchanges were preserved for future review.

## I. PROPOSAL MANAGEMENT

The “Proposal Management” page acted as the homepage for all activities relating to an individual MP’s Proposals. From this page, MPs could complete Proposals and redirect to a Proposal’s bid form, designate contacts associated with each Proposal (who received emails when Proposal related activity occurred), upload required bid form documents, create, clone, or delete a Proposal, and redirect to the “Proposal Books” page, which contained all files and documented history relating to individual Proposals.

## V. OVERVIEW OF TRANCHE 1 CPRE PROPOSAL PROCESS

The CPRE Tranche 1 solicitation was broken into three divisions: Duke Energy Carolinas, Duke Energy Progress, and Asset Acquisition. This division was reflected on the Website where each solicitation had its own site, or “Silo,” within the Website. The separate Silos were used so that all data associated with the particular solicitation was self-contained, instead of being co-mingled with unrelated data. The data on each Silo was preserved for future review. The three Silos had identical structures and varied insofar as to accommodate minor differences in the solicitations. The Duke Energy RFP solicitation Website was released on April 6, 2018.

To register on a Silo, interested users were asked to read and agree to the terms and conditions put forth by the Independent Administrator, complete a “reCAPTCHA check,” that is “I am not a robot,” for website security, and complete the standard registration information, including a primary and secondary contact. Further, each individual had the option of registering as a Market Participant, or Non-Market Participant (“Non-MP”). Once registered, each individual received an automatic email notification acknowledging successful registration to the Silo along with a temporary username and password, which could be changed after login.

General information regarding the solicitation was made public upon the release of the Website. Certain features were made available to non-registrants, including the solicitation schedule, any announcements made thus far, public documents, viewership to Q&A, and website tutorials in both written and video formats. All other public information was available to registered users on the Silos; this included the Q&A forum, the Messages forum, and, following release of the Proposal form, the Proposal Management page. The Duke Companies Proposal Team required expanded Website access, and the IA selectively changed their registrant title to “DE Admin,” which gave access to additional features on their respective Silo.

The Website was designed to be the medium for all CPRE related activities. As stated previously, embedded in the Website were three Silos, each representing a unique CPRE Tranche I process. Each Silo automatically saved all user activity tagged with the user information and a time and date stamp. Additionally, the IA strictly encouraged all participants to use the Website for all CPRE activities, thereby ensuring a complete record of the solicitation process.

Beginning on May 11, 2018, draft RPPA and RFP documents were available to registered users for the purpose of the commenting period. All registered users had access to these documents. Registered users were invited to provide comments on a special “Comments” page. Interested persons, and

**Figure 3: Standard Proposal Book File System**



especially MPs, were invited to review the draft documents and offer suggestions that would enable them to offer robust Proposals. In effect, interested parties were invited to help draft the RFP documents. The Comments page separated each RFP document into individual sections with the opportunity to provide explicit changes by “red-line” revisions, accompanied by a brief explanation of the intended result. While the approach has been very successful in other jurisdiction, the response in Tranche 1 provided few red-lined changes and the comments were along the line of “this section should be changed”, without specific textural suggestions. The IA is hopeful there will be a more engaged response in Tranche 2.

On July 10, 2018, the Proposal form was released on the Website to all MPs. An announcement was made on each Silo, and an automatic email notification was sent informing the MPs of the release. When an MP created a Proposal, a corresponding Proposal Book folder was automatically generated within the MP’s Proposal Books. A standard Proposal Book folder is shown in Figure 3, depicting subfolders containing uploads from the Proposal Form (Proposal Support Docs; Other Eligibility

Documentation), Proposal submission and messaging history (Proposal History), and documents uploaded post submission period (Cure Documents).

The MPs were given nearly three months to complete the Proposal form on their respective Silo. During that time, the IA monitored the Website daily to ensure the functionality of the Website and to monitor and respond to all general and project specific questions. The IA achieved this by updating the schedule when appropriate, posting announcements, updating the FAQ’s page, and responding to posts on the Q&A page and the Message Board in a timely manner.

## **VI. PRE-PROPOSAL SUBMISSION ACTIVITIES**

### **A. REGISTRATION**

On April 6, 2018, Accion Group, opened registration on the Website. The Website contained three Silos: Duke Energy Carolinas, Duke Energy Progress, and Asset Acquisition. Once the Website was made public, interested parties had the ability to register on any Silo as Non-Market Participants or Market Participants. Registration on the Website remained open throughout the Tranche 1 CPRE process.

Registration was made straightforward and secure. The Registration page was accessed via the homepage of the Website through a tab on the menu bar titled “Register.” Upon clicking the tab, users were introduced to the Terms and Conditions put forth by the IA, which they were then required to read and agree with to proceed. Users were then directed to a security page where the Website utilized *reCAPTCHA* technology to authenticate registrants.

Users were then transferred to the Registration Page, pictured in Figure 4. Registration was a crucial first step in the online solicitation for documentation purposes. Once registered, all user activity on the Website was automatically saved with an individual’s identifying data. This provided a complete history of all CPRE related activities which could be tied to individual users.

**Figure 4: Registration Page on the Website**


As highlighted on the top of the Registration Page, users were required to Register as either an Applicant or Non-Applciant, which is synonymous with Market Participant and Non-Market Participant. Non-MPs had restricted use on the Website compared to MPs. This allowed Non-MPs to have necessary access to understand the progression and process of the CPRE program without participating as a Market Participant. Likewise, MPs had all necessary tools to fully participate in Tranche 1 on the Website. Figure 5 identifies Website access granted to Non-MPs and MPs.

**Figure 5: Access to the Website for Non-MP’s and MPs. Check marks signify access.**

	Non-MPs	MPs
Schedule	✓	✓
Announcements	✓	✓
Documents	✓	✓
Viewership to Q&A	✓	✓
Q&A		✓
User Profile	✓	✓
Tutorial	✓	✓
FAQ	✓	✓
Proposal Management		✓

Registration was available throughout the Tranche 1 process; however, Figure 6 represents the number of users registered to the Website as of the Proposal Submission deadline on October 9, 2018. Within the DEC Silo, 167 MPs registered from 147 different companies. Within the DEP Silo, 82 MPs registered from 72 different companies. A list of states and territories represented on the Website is shown in Figure 7.

The IA is satisfied with the dissemination of information about this RFP. Throughout the submission process, the Website received 364 MP and Non-MP registrants from thirty-four (34) jurisdictions, including the District of Columbia, and two Canadian provinces. These figures confirm that there was significant engagement from a wide range of companies.



**Figure 7: Registration statistics on the Website from April 6, 2018 to October 9, 2018**

State / Territory	Registered Users
Alabama	5
Arizona	5
California	44
Colorado	6
Connecticut	2
District of Columbia	6
Florida	30
Georgia	21
Hawaii	1
Idaho	2
Illinois	13
Indiana	3
Maryland	6
Massachusetts	1
Minnesota	3
Mississippi	1
Missouri	2
Nevada	1
New Hampshire	3
New Jersey	5
New Mexico	1
New York	10
North Carolina	128
Ohio	2
Ontario CA	5
Oregon	1
Pennsylvania	3
Quebec CA	1
South Carolina	18
Tennessee	4
Texas	19
Vermont	1
Virginia	7
Washington	4
<b>Total:</b>	<b>364</b>

## B. IA GUIDANCE AND COMMUNICATION

### 1. Tutorial and Documents Pages

The IA maintained daily oversight of the Website and provided all means of Website and CPRE guidance. Within the Tutorial page, registrants could access a seven-page written tutorial overviewing the Website navigation, its features, and how to properly complete a Proposal form, as well as a six-minute video walkthrough highlighting the same. The IA also utilized the Documents page to post helpful information regarding the CPRE process, including the RFP and RPPA, Grid Locational Guidance, and Late Stage information. Before the Proposal submission deadline on October 9, 2018, the IA uploaded more than 60 documents.

### 2. Q&A and Messages

For any questions or concerns, MPs contacted the IA via the Q&A or Messages pages. The IA created these pages to ensure that reasonable and efficient communications could be completed and documented on the Website. If the IA received phone calls or emails from MPs, the inquirer was immediately directed to continue the correspondence via the Website.

The Q&A page and the Message Board were created for distinct purposes. The Q&A page was open from the release of the Website on April 6, 2018, and closed at the end of the Submission period, on October 9, 2018. Questions on the Q&A page were non-project specific, and could therefore be useful to many Tranche 1 participants. Questions were visible to all users after the IA submitted their response. For all other questions during this time, MPs were directed to the Message Board. The intended uses of the Q&A page and Message Board were explicitly stated in both the written and video tutorials, and were displayed on their respective pages. After October 9, 2018, the Q&A page was disabled and all communication between the IA and MPs occurred on the Message Board. All posts on the Q&A page remained visible to registered users for the entirety of the Tranche 1 process.

On the DEC Silo, 34 MPs asked a total of 172 questions on the Q&A page between April 6, 2018 and October 9, 2018. 14 MPs asked one question, and one MP asked 31 questions. In DEP during the same period, seven MPs asked a total of 22 questions on the Q&A page. Figures 8 and 9 below show the percent of total Q&A posts shown by individual MPs on the DEC and DEP Silos.

Figure 8





Figure 9



### C. BIDDER WEBINARS/CONFERENCES

A Pre-Bid Conference (“Webinar” or “Conference”) was held on May 17, 2018 for which participants were invited to register and participate in the Webinar by going to the RFP Website, logging onto the first Silo (DEC) and selecting the “Pre-Bid Webinar” tab on the menu bar.

The following announcement was posted on the RFP Website on May 8, 2019 announcing the Pre-Bid Conference:

*From: decpre@acciongroup.com*

*To: [Website Registrant]*

*Subject: Duke Energy Carolinas - Announcement Posting*

*Please do not reply to this auto-generated email.*

*An announcement has been posted on the Duke Energy Carolinas website. Information about the announcement follows:*

*Reference #: 3*

*Date Posted: 5/8/2018 1:37:33 PM*

*Announcement:*

*The Independent Administrator and Duke will present the CPRE RFP webinar for interested persons on Thursday, May 17, 2018, beginning at 8:30 am (Eastern). To register for the webinar, visit the RFP website <https://decprerfp2018.accionpower.com>, and log onto the first silo – Duke Energy Carolinas CPRE RFP – 600 MW and select the “Bidder Webinar” on the menu bar.*

*If you would no longer like to receive these announcement notifications, click the link below.*

*[Unsubscribe](#)*

*<https://decprerfp2018.accionpower.com>*

Figure 10

States Represented	Attendees
Arizona	1
California	10
Colorado	2
District of Columbia	1
Florida	9
Georgia	2
Illinois	5
Indiana	1
Minnesota	2
Nevada	1
New Jersey	1
New York	1
North Carolina	44
Ohio	1
South Carolina	5
Tennessee	7
Texas	5
Virginia	2
Washington	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>101</b>

Upon successful registration on the RFP Website for the Webinar, registrants received confirmation of their registration and notification that Webinar call-in details would be emailed to everyone who registered within 24 hours before the Webinar.

One hundred twenty-five (125) individuals registered to attend the Pre-bid Webinar representing 60 Companies from 19 states.

A detailed breakdown showing states represented is displayed in Figure 10.

Of the total registrants, 21 were from Duke Energy, four were from the IA Team and one Staff member registered. One hundred one (101) individuals of the 125 registrants actually signed in to participate in the Webinar. Figure 11 shows the breakdown of individuals who registered to attend the Pre-Bid Webinar.

While registrants were encouraged to pre-register for the Webinar, and reminders were sent to encourage registration, no individual was ultimately denied access to participate in the Webinar. The Webinar Access information was also posted on the Announcement page prior to the start time to accommodate those who had not

registered but wished to participate. Twenty (20) individuals registered after the Webinar had commenced.

The presentation slides created for the Webinar were posted on the RFP Website prior to the Webinar on May 16, 2017, for the benefit of all registrants and potential MPs, and additionally a recording of the entire program was posted on the Website following its completion, in order to provide all information for those unable to participate in the Webinar.

During the Webinar Duke and the IA provided background of the solicitation and an overview of the RFP process. The Webinar provided the participants with information on the following topics:

- Registration on the RFP Website
- Overview and Background
- HB 589 “Competitive Energy Solutions Law” for North Carolina
- CPRE Overview
- Information about the IA and the IA’s role
- Communications protocols

Figure 11



- Standards of Conduct/Expectation of MPs
- Tranche 1 Capacity and Schedule
- Proposal Requirements/Types accepted
- Evaluation Process
- Interconnection
- Pro Forma and Storage
- Asset Acquisition Proposals
- RFP Website and Video Tutorials

Finally, the participants were given an opportunity to ask questions. The Webinar produced thirty-nine (39) questions, which were answered by Duke Personnel or the IA. All responses from Duke were reviewed by the IA. The questions and written responses were posted on the CPRE Tranche 1 RFP Website on May 30, 2018. Participants were advised that the written responses should be used when preparing Proposals, as the oral response at the Pre-Bid Webinar may have been incomplete.

## **VII. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION**

### **A. SUBMISSION PROCESS**

On July 10, 2018, the Proposal Management page, which served as the homepage for all Proposals, was released to registered MPs. Upon its release, an announcement was made on the Website, and was also sent via email to all registered participants.<sup>11</sup>

The Proposal Management page allowed MPs to manage their Proposals from start to finish. Features of this page included the ability, to start, edit, clone, submit, or delete Proposals. They could also manage uploaded documents, change notification settings, and generally monitor the status of their Proposals. These features were explained in detail in both the written and video tutorials.

The Proposal submission deadline was on October 9, 2018, giving MPs nearly three months from the release of the Proposal form to submit a Proposal. The IA estimated that it took a minimum of one to three hours to complete the Proposal form if all document uploads were previously assembled. The IA therefore stressed to MPs the importance of starting Proposals well in advance of the submission deadline. Announcements were posted on August 6, 2018, and September 28, 2018 notifying MPs of this guidance.

<sup>11</sup> Users received email notifications of announcements automatically, however this setting could be turned off in their User Profile. Users who turned off email notifications did not receive notification of the release of the Proposal Management page.

**Figure 12: Announcement from the IA reminding MPs to allow at least 3 hours to complete Proposal form**

9/28/2018 9:11:23 AM As a reminder, the DUKE CPRE proposals are due on Tuesday, October 9, 2018, at noon EPT. The Market Participants (“MPs”) **should allow at least 3 hours** to complete the proposal form, **after** assembly of required documents for upload as well as all required information. A copy of the proposal form is provided on the document page as a worksheet to assist in assembling proposal information. MPs are reminded that all proposal must be priced below avoided cost. The MP is to enter one value on the proposal form and the website will automatically calculate and present the price for each period. MPs are encouraged to complete and submit their proposal form on time if they intend to participate in the Duke CPRE RFP process because late proposals will not be accepted. Please **CLICK** on the submit button once you complete the proposal form.

(Ref.# 18)

The electronic submission process provided MPs with several features which aimed to streamline the bidding process. First, all uploaded documents were automatically saved and organized into a Proposal folder system. Second, if an MP submitted an incomplete Proposal, a PDF version of the Proposal form appeared as currently completed with all incomplete fields highlighted in red. Finally, MPs could clone a Proposal at any time. Cloned Proposals created a new Proposal with identical information from the original; this feature allowed MPs who wished to submit similar, but not identical Proposals an the ability to duplicate relevant data with a single click.

## B. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

### 1. Avoided Cost Thresholds

The CPRE program solicited resources that were priced below administratively-established avoided costs. The RFP provided avoided cost rates for three pricing periods: Summer, Non-Summer, and Off Peak, to which all Proposals must have bid at or below. The following are the charts of pricing periods taken from the RFP.

**Figure 13**

<b>Transmission Connected Projects</b>				
<b><u>Avoided costs (\$/MWh)</u></b>	<b><u>DEC</u></b>		<b><u>DEP</u></b>	
	<b><u>Summer</u></b>	<b><u>Non-Summer</u></b>	<b><u>Summer</u></b>	<b><u>Non-Summer</u></b>
<b><u>Capacity + Energy On Peak</u></b>	\$58.00	\$74.90	\$57.40	\$78.20
<b><u>Energy Off Peak</u></b>	\$36.40		\$35.70	

**Figure 14**


<b>Distribution Connected Projects</b>				
<b><u>Avoided costs (\$/MWh)</u></b>	<b><u>DEC</u></b>		<b><u>DEP</u></b>	
	<b><u>Summer</u></b>	<b><u>Non-Summer</u></b>	<b><u>Summer</u></b>	<b><u>Non-Summer</u></b>
<b><u>Capacity + Energy On Peak</u></b>	\$59.40	\$76.70	\$58.50	\$79.70
<b><u>Energy Off Peak</u></b>	\$37.20		\$36.20	

## 2. Proposals Fees

Each MP in this RFP was required to pay a non-refundable “Proposal Fee” with each Proposal submitted based on the facility’s nameplate capacity. For PPA Proposals, a minimum fee of five hundred dollars (\$500) per MW with a maximum of ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) was due at the time each Proposal was submitted. For Asset Acquisition Proposals, a non-refundable minimum Proposal Fee of ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) was due for BOT and Joint Venture Proposals.

Proposal Fees were automatically calculated using the nameplate capacity entered on each Proposal Form, and instructions for electronic payment were provided both on the Proposal Form, and additionally on the RFP Website documents page. Failure to submit the Proposal Fee resulted in automatic disqualification of the Proposal from further consideration.

The IA received and reconciled all Proposal Fees with corresponding Proposals and confirmed that all fees were paid and received no later than 12:00 PM EDT (Noon) on the Proposal due date, as directed by the RFP Documents. The total amount of Proposal Fees received was \$922,710. Figure 15 shows the breakdown of fees received for DEC, DEP and AA Proposals submitted, including all refunded Proposal Fees. During the reconciliation process, the IA reached out via the Message Board to one DEC MP who failed to complete and submit two Proposals but paid both Proposal Fees, and one AA MP who overpaid their Proposal fee. Upon confirmation from both MPs the IA refunded the \$20,000 Proposal Fees for the unsubmitted Proposals and the \$500 overpayment.



Fees were not refunded in the case of any modification of the RFP schedule, rejection of any Proposal, or failure by a winning MP to execute a PPA.

## C. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION STATISTICS

### 1. Submission

Most MPs submitted more than a single Proposal. In DEC, 10 of the 18 bidding MPs submitted more than one Proposal. In DEP, three MPs submitted only one Proposal while seven of 10 bidding MPs submitted more than one Proposal. Eight MPs submitted only one Proposal in DEC, while one MP submitted 15. The average number of Proposals submitted by an MP was three in DEC and two in DEP.

Figure 16






Figure 17



Both DEC and DEP had a robust number of Proposal submissions; DEC received 58 Proposals and DEP received 20. All Proposals were for solar photovoltaic generation. Three Proposals were submitted with energy storage systems integrated with PV systems in DEC, while one Proposal did the same in DEP. One Proposal would interconnect to the distribution system in DEC, and three would do the same in DEP; the remaining Proposals on each Silo required transmission system interconnection.

Figures 18, 19, 20




## 2. Generating Capacity

### Duke Energies Carolina (DEC)

DEC received more than four times the targeted 600 MW for CPRE Tranche 1. Proposals were submitted with between seven and 80 MW of generating capacity, and totaled 2732.72 MW. The average Proposal was submitted with 47.16 MW of generating capacity.


Figure 21



### Duke Energies Progress (DEP)

DEP received more than 15 times the targeted 80 MW for CPRE Tranche 1. Proposals were submitted between 7.02 and 80 MW of generating capacity, and totaled 1,231.15 MW. The average Proposal was submitted with 61.55 MW of generating capacity.

Figure 22



### 3. Transmission and Distribution

A goal of CPRE was to have “shovel ready” projects move forward by using available transmission and distribution resources.<sup>12</sup> MPs were required to identify the Point of Interconnection (POI) to which their project would connect, as well as whether the MP desired distribution level or transmission level service. All projects 20 MW and larger were required to have interconnection at transmission level. Projects sized smaller than 10 MW were required to have connection at distribution level. Projects sized 10 MW to 19 MW could interconnect at transmission level, but to maximize use of existing capacity for were assigned to the distribution system. A significantly higher number of MPs proposed to interconnect at the transmission level than to the distribution. In DEC, 57 Proposals sought transmission interconnection while only one sought distribution interconnection. In DEP, 17 Proposals sought transmission interconnection while only three sought distribution interconnections.

Figure 23

TRANSMISSION VS. DISTRIBUTION (DEC)





Figure 24

TRANSMISSION VS. DISTRIBUTION (DEP)



### 4. Submission by State

Pursuant to the CPRE requirements, all proposed facilities for DEC and DEP were required to be located in the respective DEC or DEP service territories. There were a total of 33 DEC Proposals totaling 1415.91 MWs and a total of 9 DEP Proposals totaling 617.3 MWs in North Carolina. In South Carolina, there were a total of 25 Proposals totaling 1316.81 MWs in DEC, and a total of 11 Proposals totaling 613.89 MWs in DEP. The IA believes Tranche 1 received a balanced load of Proposals between North Carolina and South Carolina.

Figure 25





Figure 26



<sup>12</sup> In furtherance of this goal, in Tranche 1 projects that had completed interconnection studies and committed to pay the cost of interconnection were recognized as “Late Stage” Proposals and were excluded from the cluster study process. Thus, the Late Stage projects were recognized as being “shovel ready” and given priority during the Step 2 evaluation process.

## VIII. EVALUATION MODEL

### A. OVERVIEW

Each Proposal was evaluated using the MP's pricing information (with three price tiers of decrement), the facility's MW AC generating capacity, and the MP's hourly production profile over 20 years ("Loadshape") information. For proposals that included storage, the facility storage parameters (nominal output, storage duration, and charging rate), and production profiles with and without storage were included in the evaluation.

The IA created a custom evaluation model based on prior experience and the needs of the CPRE program ("Evaluation Model") which utilized the bid input parameters to calculate each Proposal's benefit ("Net Benefit") to the Company system over the twenty-year PPA term. A Proposal's Net Benefit is the sum of the facility's net energy benefit and the facility's capacity benefit, less the costs of system upgrades required to interconnect the facility.

$$\text{Net Benefit (\$/MWh)} = \text{Net Energy Benefit (\$/MWh)} + \text{Capacity benefit (\$/MWh)} - \text{T\&D (\$/MWh)}$$

In Step 1, the proposals were ranked based on the net energy and capacity benefits, excluding T&D system upgrade costs. In the Step 2 process, the T&D system upgrade costs for projects were calculated in an iterative process starting with the most attractive proposals and then imputed to the Proposal in the final ranking of Proposals.

### B. REQUIRED INPUT DATA

#### 1. Loadshape 8760

For each Proposal, the MP was required to supply a 20-year 8760 Loadshape that best represented the long-term output of the facility. The 8760 Loadshape was subject to review by the Independent Administrator to ascertain that the data within the Loadshape does not exceed the capability of the proposed facility.

A Proposal that included storage was required to submit a pre-storage Loadshape as well as the post-storage Loadshape. The pre-storage Loadshape represented the facility generation with the storage capability turned off. The post storage Loadshape represented the MP's best effort to utilize the facility with its storage capability to maximize facility value (but remain within the practical limits of the energy storage capability). The pre-storage Loadshape was compared to the post-storage Loadshape to evaluate whether the MP exceeded the limits of his Proposal's storage capability in submitting the post-storage Loadshape. The evaluation of a Proposal that included storage was based upon the post-storage 8760 20-year Loadshape data.

A Proposal that did not include storage was required to submit the single 20-year 8760 Loadshape which was used in the evaluation of the facility.

#### 2. Facility Pricing

The CPRE program required that each Proposal was priced as a decrement (i.e., below) the levelized 20-year avoided cost identified in the RFP. This decrement was a single \$/MWh amount that applied to each avoided cost pricing period. Once a single decrement amount was entered, the Website

automatically converted the decrement into a price that would be below avoided costs for each of Duke's avoided cost price periods. The Proposal form prevented the entry of pricing above Duke's avoided costs. The Website Proposal form presented the calculated prices for each pricing period so the MP could confirm the pricing Proposal was as desired. As noted above, after the Proposal submission period closed, the IA provided each MP with a summary of their respective Proposal(s) and received a confirmation from each MP that the pricing was as intended.

The Avoided Cost rate was a three-tier rate which covers:

- a. Summer Peak – the non-weekend and non-holiday hours between 1:00 PM and 9:00 PM during the months of June through September.
- b. Non-Summer Peak – the non-weekend and non-holiday hours between 6:00 AM and 1:00 PM during the months of October through May.
- c. Off-Peak – all weekend and holiday hours as well as weekday/non-holiday hours that fell outside of the 8 hour "Summer Peak" band during the months June through September and those weekday/non-holiday hours that fell outside of the 7 hour "Non-Summer Peak" band during the months October through May.

MP pricing was submitted as a decrement to the appropriate forecasted Avoided Cost rate which differed for transmission/distribution connection as well as balancing area (DEC or DEP). The minimum acceptable decrement was zero, which replicated the forecasted Avoided Cost rate.

There was a range of price decrements submitted. The median price decrement for Proposals submitted in both DEC and DEP was 6.73 \$/MWh.

### **3. Other Required Inputs**

- a. In addition, evaluation of each facility included the following data:
- b. Inverter Capability
- c. Interconnection (Distribution or transmission) Voltage
- d. Storage Capability (if applicable) in MW nominal output
- e. Storage Capacity (if applicable) in Hours duration at the nominal output
- f. Maximum Storage charging rate in MW (if applicable)

The inverter capability represented the maximum output from a project as submitted on each 8760. The interconnection voltage was included in the modeling to determine the energy that could flow from the facility.

## **C. EVALUATION MODEL PROCESSING**

The first iteration of the evaluation model calculated for each proposal the capacity benefit, the energy benefit, and the Proposal cost on a year-by-year basis by using the MP's pricing information for the three price tiers, the inverter capability, the basic storage parameters (nominal output, storage duration, and charging rate) if storage is included, and the MP's Loadshape information. During the second

iteration of the evaluation model, the after-curtailment, and, if appropriate, the after-storage benefit was calculated. Finally, the Proposal was evaluated on its twenty-year net present value of benefit per MWh which was used by the IA for ranking Proposals.

The evaluation model processing routine included these key elements:

**1. Pricing: Assign Periods and Generate 20 year \$/MWh**

Each hour within the single 8760-hour year was assigned to one of the three pricing tiers (see “Facility Pricing” above) and an energy price was also assigned. This was repeated for all years until each hour of the twenty years of Loadshape data was assigned an energy price. Adjustments were made as required for holidays and weekends, daylight savings time shift, and leap year calendar effects.

**2. Capacity Benefit Calculation**

The facility’s capacity benefit is the cost savings associated with the proposed facility’s ability to defer future generating capacity on the Duke system. Each year of the production profile (8760) input data was compared against a Loss of Load Expectation (“LOLE”) matrix that measured a facility’s ability to generate electricity during periods of critical need for the grid. The facility’s resulting capacity benefit was estimated by comparison to the Duke system (DEC or DEP) avoided cost. The benefit was estimated by using the system’s avoided capacity cost (on a \$/MW basis projected from the future cost of utility constructed supply side peaking generation) and allocated to that facility.

**3. Net Energy Benefit Calculation (Energy Benefit less Proposal Cost)**

The Net Energy Benefit was calculated as energy savings to Duke Energy resulting from the operation of the proposed facility. The energy savings for a facility was the difference between the Duke Energy marginal energy cost and the proposed facility’s energy cost (as established by the MP’s submitted pricing). This analysis was run on an 8760 hour per year basis for twenty years. In any hour that the facility generates energy, the energy savings for each hour would be the facility output multiplied by the difference between the Duke marginal energy price and the facility energy price. This was conducted in an iterative process to incorporate the impacts of curtailment and storage (if included).

**IX. EVALUATION**

**A. OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION PROCESS**

The IA strictly followed the evaluation protocol set forth in the Tranche 1 RFP and in NCUC Rule R8-71(f)(3). Further, all appropriate evaluation process information was communicated to MPs in a timely manner. The IA composed a flow chart depicting the entire process, which was then discussed with the Companies and shared on the Website for the MPs on September 19, 2018. Further, the Announcements, Messages, and Schedule pages were monitored daily to reflect the current Tranche 1 plan, or to remind MPs of an upcoming evaluation deadline.

The major components of the evaluation process are described in depth below. The process was designed to evaluate each Proposal individually while maximizing efficiency and fairness. The IA believes this process succeeded in this goal, and all refinement suggestions for Tranche 2 remain minor.

## **B. PRICE SCORING SHEETS**

In accordance with the Appendix F of the RFP, the Price Scoring Sheet (“Scoring Sheet”) was used to when reviewing each Proposal. The Scoring Sheets allocated weighted scores to each evaluation category, and category scores were summed to reach a Proposal’s overall evaluation score. This method confirmed that each Proposal was evaluated using the same criteria. An example of a Scoring Sheet is attached as Appendix A.

## **C. EVALUATION TEAMS**


The IA created five subject matter evaluation teams: Modeling (“Modeling”), Financial (“Financial”), Legal (“Legal”), Transmission & Distribution (“T&D”), and Engineering/Project Sufficiency (“PST”). Each team contained subject matter experts and focused their work on their respective portions of the Proposal evaluation. Each of the teams used their designated sections of the Scoring Sheet as the basis of their evaluation. The Modeling Team designed and created the Evaluation Model and worked to determine the “Price Score” defined on the Scoring Sheet. The Financial Team determined the “Credit Worthiness” score for each Proposal by evaluating the MP’s financial assurances and credit requirements. The Legal Team focused on three areas: determining that the MP could complete permitting to meet COD, determining that the Proposal had project site control for full term, and determining that the Proposal had site control to the POI for full term. The PST determined scores for four categories: experience of the project team, equipment to be used, required control equipment, and quality of project design. Finally, the T&D Team worked to assist the Modeling Team in determining the Price Score of each Proposal by conducting the T&D analysis of system upgrade costs as described below in Section XI.

## **D. CURE PROCESS**

After Proposals were submitted, it was necessary to fix any inaccuracies made by MPs, and to gather any further materials requested by the IA’s evaluation team. This process (“Cure Process”), cures occurred at the beginning stages of Step 1. In a few instances, the IA sought information from MPs when Proposals were moved from the reserve list and to the competitive tier, after the start of Step 2. The number of cures per day is shown in Figure 27. Together there were 125 cures in DEC and DEP throughout the evaluation process, with an average of 1.5 cures per Proposal.<sup>13</sup> The Cure Process confirmed the data inputted on the Proposal Forms to be correct and ready for evaluation. It is worth noting that the initial identification of deficiencies with Proposals, immediately after their receipt, obviated the need to delay evaluation later during the iterative process of elevating Proposals from the Reserve List to the Competitive Tier.

<sup>13</sup> Includes all cures/clarifications directly related to the characteristics of the proposal. This does not include cures for other aspects of the evaluation process, such as Proposal security Forms.

Figure 27: Number of cures per day over the evaluation process




The Cure Process immediately followed Proposal submission on October 9, 2018, with each Evaluation team performing an overview analysis of the data pertaining to their expertise. If any questions were raised or clarifications required, an MP was notified via the Message Board and was given an appropriate amount of time to respond. In total, 48 of the original 58 DEC Proposals and 14 of the original 20 DEP Proposals submitted cures at some point during evaluation.

Most of the cures were identified and accomplished using the Confirm Bid Data Memorandum (“Confirm Bid Data Memo”, or “Memo”) created by the IA. On October 16, 2018, the IA sent a Memo to the MP of each Proposal with the following information:

- Technology
- Generating Capacity MW AC
- Installed DC Rating [kWpDC]
- Is Storage Included?
- Storage Size (MW)
- Storage Output Rating (MW)
- Price Decrement
- Summer Decrement
- Non-Summer Decrement
- Off-Peak Decrement
- Forecasted COD
- Curtail Output Without Disconnecting?
- Offering to Reduce MW size for Same MWh?
- MW Reduction Amount up to 10%
- Late Stage Proposal?

These Memos resulted in MPs identifying 31 DEC Proposals and 13 DEP Proposals that required cures. MPs were required to respond to the Memo with either confirmation of correct data or identification of inaccurate data. If an MP did not respond, the IA interpreted all data to be correct and evaluated as such. Following the Memo correspondence, alterations of data in these categories was prohibited.

Figure 28



1. DEC

In total, 102 cures/clarifications were made in DEC. 94 of the 102 cures were made during the Step 1 evaluation. The most requested cure by the Evaluation Team was the Generating Capacity of the facility. This is likely linked to confusion on the Proposal Form regarding the difference between inverter capacity and generating capacity as it applies to overall generation, and will be clarified for Tranche 2. Further, many Proposals used “MW” units when the Proposal Form indicated “kW.” All cure categories and frequencies are depicted in Figure 28.


Most Proposals were submitted with no need for major adjustments. 62% of Proposals required no cures (10) or had only one cure (26). Three Proposals, all from the same MP, required eight cures.

2. DEP

In DEP, 23 cures were made. The Step 1 evaluation accounted for 22 of these cures. The most requested cure by the evaluation team was to change the units of the Installed DC Rating from MW to kW as requested on the Proposal Form. All cure categories and frequencies are depicted in Figure 29.

Most DEP Proposals were submitted with no need for major adjustments. 57% of Proposals required no cures (6) or had only one cure (7). Two Proposals required three cures.

Figure 29



X. STEP 1 EVALUATION PROCESS

A. OUTLINE OF PROCESS

The goal of the Step 1 evaluation was to categorize Proposals into three Tiers: The Primary Competitive Tier, the Competitive Tier Reserve, and the release list, ranked in order from most attractive to least attractive for ratepayers prior to the Step 2 T&D evaluation. The Tiers were constructed based upon two metrics: The Net Benefit (\$/MWh) of each Proposal calculated by the Evaluation Model, and the cumulative generating capacity MW AC.

The Tier structure was created by the IA for the benefit of the MPs. In the Step 1 evaluation, Proposals were sorted based on the overall benefit to ratepayers prior to the Step 2 T&D evaluation of

system upgrade costs. This allowed only Proposals with the highest likelihood of being selected as a winner being included in the Primary Competitive Tier and therefore required to post Proposal security. The Competitive Tier Reserve included Proposals with a lower likelihood of being selected for a PPA. A Proposal on the Reserve Tier remained in the CPRE program, but was not required to provide Proposal security until notified that the Proposal was eligible for evaluation in Step 2. Proposals in the Competitive Tier Reserve were moved into the Primary Competitive Tier when other Proposals dropped out due to declining to provide Proposal security, or were found to be above Avoided Cost during the iterative Step 2 evaluation, necessitating adding additional MWs to the Step 2 evaluation in order to meet the Tranche 1 goals.

The composition of each Tier at the end of Step 1 (“Initial Tier Ranking”) was completed on December 6, 2018. On that date, a memo was uploaded to each Proposal’s Cure Folder with the Proposal’s initial status. Further, the IA published the “CPRE Tranche 1 Initial Status Report” for public viewership on the IA Website on December 7, 2018.

The final phase of the Step 1 evaluation required all Primary Competitive Tier Proposals to provide Proposal security. If an MP declined, their Proposal was released from CPRE. This allowed the IA to filter out uncommitted Proposals outright before having to undertake a time-consuming T&D evaluation in Step 2. Once an MP provided an acceptable form of Proposal security, the IA notified the T&D Team to begin evaluation of the Proposal, thus beginning the Step 2 evaluation of the Proposal.

## **B. INITIAL TIER RANKING**

### **1. Primary Competitive Tier**

The Primary Competitive Tier was composed of Proposals with the highest Net Benefit (\$/MWh) as determined by the Evaluation Model before considering T&D system upgrade costs. The IA’s goal was for the Primary Competitive Tier to contain two times the MW goal in each Silo, thus allowing for the elimination of some Proposals while still meeting the intended MW goal. This also allowed the IA to continue evaluation of Proposals beyond the original goals without a delay as new Proposals were asked to post security. Each Proposal received a memo regarding its Initial Tier Ranking status at the end of Step 1. In line with the RFP standards, MPs were given seven business days following notification of Primary Competitive Tier status to provide Proposal security in the amount of \$20/kW.

CPRE is a multi-year procurement program, with the goals of Tranche 1 designed to begin the competitive procurement process. Tranche 1 had a goal of 600 MW for DEC and 80 MW for DEP. The DEC Initial Primary Competitive Tier contained 24 Proposals totaling 1270.22 MW. All Proposals selected for the Competitive Tier were bid in with a price decrement at least 8.9 below avoided cost, and with an average price decrement 12.36 below avoided cost. Following the Evaluation Model calculation, the estimated Net Benefit of Proposals was at least \$6.48/MWh, and averaged \$9.94/MWh. All Proposals selected were highly competitive and provided significant value to ratepayers.

The DEP Initial Primary Competitive Tier contained eight Proposals totaling 469.52 MW. The MW goal for DEP was 80 MW, thus the 469.52 MWs selected far exceeded the two-times MW goal. As stated above, this target goal was created to ensure that enough MPs would supply Proposal security and maintain their initial value to begin the Step 2 T&D evaluation. Because the DEP MW goal was smaller

than that of DEC (80 MW vs. 600 MW), individual Proposals in DEP represented a larger fraction of the MW targeted goal than those in DEC. In fact, several Proposals in DEP were bid with a generating capacity equal to the MW goal. For this reason, the IA chose to include Proposals representing a greater MW total than in DEC in the Initial Tier Ranking for DEP.

All DEP Proposals selected in the Initial Tier Ranking were bid in a price decrement at least 7.1 below avoided cost, and with an average price decrement 14.01 below avoided cost. Following the Evaluation Model calculation, the estimate Net Benefit of Proposals was at least 5.58 \$/MWh and averaged 10.35 \$/MWh. All Proposals selected were highly competitive and would potentially provide value to ratepayers.

Figure 30

Primary Competitive Tier Proposals			
	Total MWs	Average Price Decrement below Avoided Cost	Average Net Benefit
DEC	1270.22	12.36	9.94 \$/MWh
DEP	469.52	14.01	10.35 \$/MWh

## 2. Competitive Tier Reserve

The Competitive Tier Reserve contained the next best Proposals in the Net Benefit (\$/MWh) ranking determined by the Evaluation Model, and equaled one times the MW goal for each Silo. Proposals selected for this Tier were considered competitive Proposals with the potential to be selected as Finalists, however the MPs were not required to post Proposal security at the time of the Initial Tier Ranking. This Tier was created by the IA specifically to benefit MPs by limiting the financial burden associated with Proposals less competitive than the best-ranked Proposals, but still considered viable for future consideration.

The DEC Competitive Tier Reserve contained 10 Proposals totaling 543.84 MW, which complied with the one-times the MW goal standard for Tier size. All Proposals selected had a price decrement that was at least 6.38 below avoided cost, and had, on average, a price decrement 7.04 below avoided cost. Following the Evaluation Model calculation, the estimated Net Benefit for Proposals was at least 4.0 \$/MWh, and on average 4.91 \$/MWh. These Proposals were still highly competitive, and would potentially provide value to ratepayers.

The DEP Competitive Tier Reserve contained eight Proposals totaling 612 MW. The IA selected more than the MW size goal for this Tier for the same reasons it over-selected in the Primary Competitive Tier. All Proposals selected had a price decrement at least 4.67 below avoided cost, and on average had a price decrement 5.93 below avoided cost. Following the Evaluation Model calculation, the estimated Net Benefit for Proposals was at least 0.94 \$/MWh and averaged 2.2 \$/MWh. All of the Proposals remained below the avoided cost threshold.

Figure 31

Competitive Tier Reserve Proposals			
	Total MWs	Average Price Decrement Below Avoided Cost	Average Net Benefit
DEC	543.84	7.04	4.91 \$/MWh
DEP	612	5.93	2.2 \$/MWh

### 3. Release List

The release list contained the least competitive Proposals. MPs with Proposals selected to the release list had the option to keep their project in CPRE by being included on the Reserve Tier. The table below depicts the response of MPs with Proposals when notified that their Proposal was identified for release, but could be on the Reserve Tier.

Figure 32

Silo	Release List Proposals	Proposals Moved to Reserve from Release
DEC	23	23
DEP	3	2

## C. PROPOSAL SECURITY

### 1. Overview

Proposal security was required from all third-party MP Proposals. As per the RFP, Proposal security equaled \$20/kW, based on the facility's inverter nameplate capacity. Proposal security was required within seven business days of MP's notification of a Proposal's selection for the Primary Competitive Tier. The Proposal security was accepted as cash, a Surety Bond, or a Letter of Credit ("LOC"). The IA provided acceptable Surety Bond and LOC forms on the IA Website as part of the RFP.

Third-party MPs had the option to withdraw their Proposal by not posting Proposal security. If an MP did not post Proposal security within the seven-business day window, the IA confirmed via the confidential Message Board that the MP intended to withdraw the Proposal from consideration. This discouraged the withdrawal of Proposals during the final contracting stages of Tranche 1 and encouraged only "shovel ready" projects to seek Step 2 review. This procedure was consistent with the design of CPRE so Tranche 1 ended with the identification of finalists by the IA, and all other Proposals would be released so the unsuccessful MPs would have their Proposal security released to be available for other projects. Additionally, the use of Proposal security greatly increased the likelihood of PPAs being executed, in contrast to what has occurred in other jurisdictions when developers are permitted to withdraw at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour.

As projects were eliminated or withdrawn from the Primary Competitive Tier, the IA proceeded to move additional Proposals into the Primary Competitive Tier; these selections were made based on the Initial Tier Ranking. When a Proposal was selected to advance to the Primary Competitive Tier, the IA notified the Proposal MP via the confidential Message Board and advised the MP of the seven-business day deadline for Proposal security (sometimes referred to as "bid security"). The following is an example of a message sent in this instance on the Website:

*Proposal [X] has been moved from the reserve list to the primary competitive tier. In order to proceed, the MP must now provide the bid security for this project, as identified in the RFP. Please use the "upload documents" feature on the message board to provide the security bond or another acceptable form of security.*

*The MP should use the message board to advise the IA if the security will be in the form of cash and IA will provide instructions. To facilitate timely evaluation of the proposal the security should be received without delay, preferable by COB on February 7, 2019. Pursuant to the terms of the RFP, the security must be provided no later than February 12, 2019.*

All Proposal security forms were uploaded by MPs to the Cure Documents folder within the Proposal Books on the IA Website. Upon submission, the IA confirmed the validity of the file and sent the relevant documents to the Duke Legal Team for review. If the Duke Legal Team declared the form to be insufficient, the IA allowed the MP to make the appropriate revisions. Below is a message by the IA to an MP in such a case:

*Duke personnel has reviewed the security form for this proposal and found two deficiencies. Please revise the document in two business days, by end of COB, Friday, February 15, 2019, and post the document using the "upload documents" button on the message board of the RFP website.*

*The deficiencies are: 1. surety bond effective date is in brackets. 2. Date of CPRE in first recital is shown as May 11, which is incorrect.*

*Needed cures: 1. remove brackets around the effective date on the first page. 2. Change the issuance date (on the bottom of the first page) from May 11, 2018, to July 10, 2018.*

Once a Proposal's security was accepted by the Duke Legal Team, the Proposal was moved from Step 1 evaluation to Step 2 T&D review.

## **2. DEC**

Within the DEC Initial Primary Competitive Tier, 60% of third-party Proposals declined to provide Proposal security. This resulted in only 15 Proposals totaling 833 MW left in the Initial Primary Competitive Tier for Step 2 T&D evaluation. The IA then advanced more projects into the Primary Competitive Tier. Using the Initial Tier ranking, the T&D Team completed preliminary evaluations of all Competitive Tier Reserve and Release List Proposals to determine the viability of each project before requesting Proposal security and moving them to Step 2 T&D evaluation. A Proposal was eliminated if: it did not have a queue number, it did not have a viable interconnection, or it was in a pre-identified constrained area and had a distribution factor above 3%. Seven Proposals were eliminated during this part of the evaluation process. Additionally, three Proposals identified as duplicates of higher-ranked projects and were removed from consideration.

In total, 22 of the 33 Proposals from the Competitive Tier Reserve or release lists were moved into the Primary Competitive Tier. Of those Proposals, four were submitted by Duke's Affiliated or DEP/DEC team and were sent to the T&D Evaluation team for Step 2 evaluation. The remaining 18 Proposals were required to provide Proposal security before advancing; 12 declined. The six Proposals which provided Proposal security were sent to the T&D Evaluation team for Step 2 evaluation. In total, 47 of the 57 DEC Proposals in the Initial Tier Ranking were moved to the Primary Competitive Tier at a point in time in the evaluation process. Of those 47 Proposals, 33 were third-party Proposals and were required to provide

Proposal security; 21 declined. Ultimately, a total of 26 Proposals were sent to the T&D Evaluation team for Step 2 evaluation.

### **3. DEP**

The DEP Initial Primary Competitive Tier included eight Proposals, of which six were required to post Proposal security and one declined. The remaining seven Proposals totaled 394.62 MW, just under five times the DEP MW goal. The IA considered this to be a sufficiently robust set of Proposals and therefore did not move any further Proposals into the Primary Competitive Tier prior to the completion of Step 2.

## **XI. STEP 2 EVALUATION PROCESS - T&D OVERVIEW**

The goal of the Step 2 evaluation process was to calculate the final Net Benefit (\$/MWh) of each Primary Competitive Tier Proposal. The main burden of this step was on the T&D Team to assign an estimated upgrade cost to each qualifying proposal. The purpose of this section is to document the steps taken by the IA and the Duke T&D Evaluation team to complete the system upgrade cost analysis for each Proposal.<sup>14</sup> This work was completed at the end of May 2019. This discussion is presented as a chronology of events, from those actions taken prior to Proposal submission. From this process the IA developed recommendations for the T&D evaluators to be employed in Tranche 2.

### **A. ACTIVITY PRIOR TO PROPOSAL SUBMISSION**

#### **1. Portfolio Study Example**

MPs expressed interest in learning more about the methodology the IA planned to use to complete the portfolio analysis. Such analysis was critical as multiple Proposals competed for the same network resources, thus necessitating allocation of line capacity between competing Proposals.

The IA prepared an example of its approach to portfolio analysis, based on previous engagements. This example was specific to the Duke CPRE process. In early September 2018, this example was reviewed with the Commission Public Staff and with Duke personnel. This review resulted in several modifications that better adapted the analysis for this project. The portfolio study example was finalized on September 19, 2018, and posted on the IA website Document page.

Separate Competitive Tiers were established for DEC and DEP by the IA and shared with the T&D Team to begin the Step 2 analysis. The Step 2 process included an analysis of potential electrical interdependency of these Proposals was performed. It was apparent from a review of the Points of Interconnection (“POI”) specified by the MPs that several of the Proposals in the Competitive Tier were electrically interdependent. The potential system impact of interdependencies were identified as the system upgrade costs for each Proposal were determined. The maps below show the geographic location

<sup>14</sup> The Duke T&D Evaluation team members all completed the separation protocol training and executed a confirming affidavit. No member of the T&D Evaluation team had involvement with the development of any Proposal from the Duke Companies Proposal Team or any affiliate of DEC or DEP that submitted a Proposal.

of the selected projects, and there was no electrical interdependency among the final Proposals, thus, sharing of network upgrade costs between Proposals was not needed.

## 2. Transmission Guidance Provided to Bidders

The T&D Team created a locational guidance document for MPs to better understand the available transmission capability and assist them in selecting viable points of interconnection. This guidance is included as Appendix B and was part of a webinar presented on May 10, 2018. A copy of the materials was available on the Document Page of the IA Website.

Notwithstanding the locational guidance, several MPs proposed non-late stage facilities in areas that were identified as constrained. The IA will not speculate on why an MP would participate in CPRE knowing their project was in a constrained area and therefore would have transmission upgrade costs assigned. Figure 33 below is a map of all DEC Proposals and the pre-identified constrained areas. Figure 34 shows all winning Proposals in DEC. Note that all winning Proposals were outside of the constrained areas. One successful DEP Proposal will interconnect at transmission level service and is shown in Figure 35. This was a late stage project.

Figure 33





Figure 34



### 3. Distribution Guidance Provided to Bidders

MPs were advised that projects smaller than 20 MW would be evaluated as requiring distribution level service. Locational guidance was provided for projects that could interconnect at distribution level via materials posted on the IA Website or linked from the Website, as well as during the May 10, 2018 webinar. Specifically, a document entitled “Method of Service Guidelines” was identified by Duke and a link to the materials was included on the IA Website.

One of the two DEP winners is a 7.02 MW project that will interconnect at distribution level. The maps shown in Figure 35 and 36 show this project’s location in a constrained area. The project was in the final Competitive Tier because it is well priced and a “late stage” project, meaning the MP accepted responsibility for system upgrade costs in the Proposal and only minor additional costs were imputed to the Proposal.

Figure 35





Figure 36



## **B. FLOW CHART OF STEP 2**

In response to a request from the Commission Public Staff, the IA produced a flow chart showing the iterative approach to this cost determination was formulated. This flow chart was provided on the IA Website on September 19, 2018, and is included as Appendix C.

The flow chart was shared and discussed during face to face meetings with the subject matter experts on the T&D Team. As the team name suggests, Duke personnel with subject matter expertise in the areas of either transmission or distribution were assigned to the team. During the Step 2 evaluations, Proposals were separated depending on whether the associated projects would interconnect at either transmission or distribution levels and were reviewed by personnel experienced in the respective areas. The flow chart was followed throughout the actual analysis of Proposals to ensure that all Proposals were evaluated using the same process and standards.

## **C. ANALYSIS REPORT FORMAT**

As part of the practice of treating each Proposal in a fair and equitable manner, a standard document was used to record and present the analysis results for each Proposal. A draft standard document was presented to both T&D Teams for consideration and modification. A mock Proposal was selected, and the Distribution team completed an example analysis to test the applicability of using this standard format. This example was shared with the T&D Team which adopted a similar approach.

## **D. COMMUNICATION DOCUMENTATION**

After the Proposal submission period closed on October 9, 2018, a "T&D EVAL" folder and confidential Message Board was opened on the DEC Silo of the IA Website for data sharing with the members of the T&D Evaluation team. This platform ensured that the exchange of files, and the file contents, had a time and date stamp, and that all Proposal data was shared securely. All members of the team shared access to these files, and this process continued until the ranking of the Competitive Tier became final.

At the same time CPRE Proposals were being evaluated, the day to day operation of Duke transmission continued. Some Duke Account Managers had dual responsibilities in addressing non-CPRE requests for transmission service and being on the T&D Evaluation team. To avoid even the appearance of CPRE ranking information being released, the IA Website provided restricted access to separate folders, thereby isolating evaluation information access on a "need to know basis." This approach prevented Duke Account Managers from viewing ranking information of Proposals, while the T&D Evaluation team, via a confidential file system, received the information needed to complete evaluations. These files are preserved on the IA Website for future review and confirmation.

Beginning on October 9, 2018, all voice or email messages between the IA evaluation team members and the T&D team were documented in a communication log with daily postings to the confidential evaluation files on the IA Website. Communication records were organized by week and posted to the "T&D Communication Log" folder on the Evaluation page of the IA Website.

All direct communication from members of the T&D Evaluation team to MPs concerning CPRE topics was prohibited. Instead, T&D Team members were instructed to provide questions to the IA, who in turn posted them on the confidential Message Board of the Website. This ensured complete documentation of all exchanges. There were no observed instances of MPs inappropriately approaching T&D Evaluation team members.

## **E. LATE STAGE PROJECTS**

Late Stage projects were recognized in Tranche 1 as a special class of Proposals. To qualify for late stage status, a project was required to have an executed state jurisdictional Facility Study agreement as of the date of Proposal submission. A project that obtained Late Stage status retained its original queue position and original network upgrade costs, if any, even if it was not selected as a winning project. Late Stage status was an advantage for a project with little to no network upgrade costs identified in their existing System Impact Study. For a project already assigned significant network upgrade costs, foregoing Late Stage status allowed for sharing of costs in the CPRE pooling process. The advantage to Late Stage status was that a project retained its original queue position, even if it was not selected as a winning project.

Considerable discussions and interactions by the IA and Account Managers, Duke attorneys, and T&D Team members was necessary to make determinations as to Late Stage eligibility. Numerous questions and confirmations required MP's responses on the Message Board because of confusion about some projects. This process started in mid-October and was not completed until mid-December.

## **F. INTERCONNECTION VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION**

The process of verifying and validating the information submitted by the MPs proved to be arduous due to confusion about queue identification numbering, whether projects were FERC-jurisdictional, and the precise POI of projects. The IA managed the confirmation process with assistance from Account Managers, T&D Team members, Duke attorneys, and the MPs. Because the identity and location of projects proposed into the CPRE program was to remain unknown to most Duke personnel, including those on the Duke Evaluation Team, information from Proposals was only provided when there was uncertainty about a Proposal, and then only to the Duke personnel with subject-matter expertise to assist the IA so the required separation protocols were maintained. Proposal verification started shortly after the close of bidding in October 2018, and continued into mid-January 2019. Those issues needing verification and validation are discussed below.

### **1. Facility Study Agreement Status**

There were several instances where the facility study agreement for a project was executed by the developer, but the final acceptance was not executed by Duke. In other instances, the study was not complete, though the MP contended that it was. Each of these instances had to be resolved before a Proposal was included in the Step 2 evaluations.

## **2. Project Size**

The CPRE maximum Proposal size for transmission connection was 80 MW; the distribution connection maximum was 20 MW. Project size was established in the interconnection request and could not be expanded, but could be reduced up to 10 percent. Confusion concerning project size was largely a result of lack of specificity on the Proposal form. Instead of using a uniform term, such as “Project Size,” the Proposal form required “capacity” size in different contexts. In cases where the Proposal form intended for MPs to submit project size, some bidders submitted nameplate MW, inverter capacity, or output MW to POI, resulting in inconsistent project capacity data. The appropriate MW capacity was established by the T&D Team through interaction with the MP on the Message Board. As a result of this process, this section of the Proposal form will be revised for Tranche 2 (“Lessons Learned”).

## **3. Transition from FERC to State**

There were several examples where MPs desired to transition their FERC projects to State jurisdiction in order to participate in CPRE. This transition involved consultation with Duke attorneys for verification. Additionally, there were instances in which proper paperwork had not been filed to accomplish this transition, or the projects did not qualify for State jurisdiction. In each instance, the MP was informed of the final determination and did not challenge the result.

## **4. Queue History**

The online Proposal form required identification of the queue number associated with the project. There were numerous instances where the MP used a queue number that was no longer valid, used the same queue number for multiple projects, or used a queue number that was invalid. In some instances, the MP presented the queue number provided by a Duke account manager, though it was determined the queue number was invalid. Similarly, there were instances of confusion as to the appropriate queue number to be used among differing Duke options and the FERC queue numbering system. The IA and the T&D Evaluation team resolved each issue prior to the start of the Step 2 evaluations, and prepared revised protocols for assigning queue numbers so the confusion will not reoccur.

## **5. Ownership Transition**

It is common for some developers to initiate project development and then sell their project to another MP prior to completion of the project. Ownership transfers are required to be filed with Duke. Unfortunately, the documentation of ownership transition was not always filed or recorded properly. Each instance of inaccuracy in ownership documentation was investigated by the IA and the T&D Evaluation team and proper documentation was recorded prior to the start of the Step 2 evaluations.

## **6. Analysis Uncertainties**

The T&D Evaluation team and the Account Managers identified several Proposals where the RFP data did not align with the existing information for the project. These included two Proposals which required clarification on their ability to successfully interconnect at the POI indicated on the Proposal Form, two Proposals where the intended POI was unclear, and several Proposals where the size presented on the Proposal Form differed from what was given at other points in the submission process.

## 7. Concluding Proposal Cures

The initial cure process was crucial to attaining the basic Proposal data needed for the ranking process. The majority of this work was completed by mid-November 2018, which allowed the Proposal ranking process to go forward. A few cures remained that were resolved in mid-December. These remaining issues did not delay the initial ranking analysis but did modify subsequent rankings.

As the Proposal cures were being resolved, it proved a challenge that Account Managers were not privy to the Proposal ranking data. Account Managers could only respond to specific questions from the T&D Evaluation team, and were also hampered in completing their daily tasks by their lack of CPRE Proposal knowledge. Both the T&D Evaluation team and the Account Managers were disadvantaged by this lack of shared knowledge.

### G. STEP 2 PROCESS

#### 1. DEC Transmission Proposals

At the conclusion of Step 1, Proposals were selected by the IA and sent to the T&D Team to begin Step 2 analysis starting on November 22, 2018. 18 Proposals totaling approximately 800 MW were included in the initial Step 2 analysis.

For each Proposal reviewed in Step 2, only information necessary to determine system impact cost was extracted from the Proposal submissions and provided to the T&D Team, and no Proposal pricing or calculated net benefit was provided. The information provided to the T&D Team is listed in Figure 37.

Figure 37

Name	Date modified	Type	Size
 x_118-01_Facility_Description	11/21/2018 12:23 ...	Microsoft Word D...	12 KB
 x_118-01_Project_Map	11/21/2018 3:26 PM	Adobe Acrobat D...	410 KB
 x_118-01_Single_Line	11/21/2018 12:21 ...	Adobe Acrobat D...	460 KB
 x_118-01_Single_Line_Drawing	11/21/2018 12:21 ...	Adobe Acrobat D...	460 KB
 x_118-01_Site_Description	11/21/2018 12:22 ...	Adobe Acrobat D...	29 KB
 x_118-01_Site_Plan	11/21/2018 3:26 PM	Adobe Acrobat D...	492 KB
 x_118-01_Transmission_Project	11/21/2018 12:22 ...	Microsoft Word D...	22 KB

The T&D Team reviewed the contents of these files and identified issues for which additional information was needed from the MP. The T&D Team shared requests with the IA via a confidential Message Board on the IA Website and the IA, in turn, interacted with the MP to collect the information and pass it to the T&D Team.<sup>15</sup> This approach ensured that the T&D Team did not have direct CPRE correspondence with the individual.

<sup>15</sup> Some requests were made via email and were then recorded in the communication log

## **2. DEP Transmission Proposals**

Proposals for DEP were selected and sent to the T&D Team. Eleven (11) Proposals, totaling over 700 MW, were sent on November 29, 2018 with the same data identified in Figure 37. The IA used the same process as described above for collecting clarifying information from MPs when necessary.

## **3. Distribution Service Analysis**

The two distribution Proposals in the Competitive Tier for DEC were delivered to the T&D team on November 29, 2018 along with the Figure 37 data.

## **H. THRESHOLD COST ESTIMATES**

A review of the location of projects confirmed there were a number in the identified constrained areas where system upgrade costs would certainly be incurred. To avoid excess analysis, the IA prepared a table with an estimated maximum upgrade cost each Proposal could bear without exceeding avoided cost. If the analysis indicated that a long transmission line upgrade or a significant substation would be needed, the system upgrade costs were estimated and compared to the threshold values previously calculated by the IA. This quickly eliminated Proposals that would be above avoided cost, thereby streamlining the transmission analysis.

Threshold values of 600, 1,200 and 1,800 megawatts were established and calculated. These threshold values were established based on the 600 MW of CPRE generation that is to be added in Tranche 1.

## **I. MEGAWATT REDUCTIONS AVAILABLE**

On the Proposal Form, MPs were asked if they would be willing to have their project sizes reduced by up to 10% if interconnection constraints were present, without changing the associated decrement price. This size reduction would not result in a change in the dollar per megawatt hour Proposal price. 31 MPs expressed their willingness to accept such a reduction if necessary. On December 12, 2018 a list of MPs willing to accept a reduction was sent to both the DEC and DEP segments of the T&D Team to be available should the IA determine it would be appropriate to reduce one or more Proposal in order to meet the Tranche 1 goals. The Tranche 1 evaluations were completed without the need to reduce the size of any Proposal.

## **J. BASE CASE FORMULATION**

### **1. Overall Base Case Discussion**

The T&D Team reviewed and established the base case after receiving the listing of ranked Proposal list on November 22, 2018. The process for confirming the base case required review of all projects in serial queue, elimination of duplicate projects, and elimination of untimely projects.

## **2. Review all Projects in Serial Queue**

Initially included in each base case were all projects with a queue position established prior to October 9, 2018. Any project that bid into CPRE was removed from this initial base case, with the exception of Late Stage projects.

## **3. Eliminate Duplicate Projects**

Some developers held queue positions for the same project with different configurations, such as different project sizing. Where there were multiple projects identified for a single location, only one could be built. Using engineering judgment, the IA and the T&D Team eliminated projects that could not proceed. At the NCUC's May 2019 technical session the IA suggested that between 50% and 80% of the projects in the queue would not be built. The IA believed that the base case should more accurately reflect the projects likely to be built.

## **4. Eliminate Untimely Projects**

Tranche 1 required in service date, referred to as the Commercial Operation Date ("COD") of January 1, 2021. However, the IA and the Duke Evaluation Team recognized it would be inappropriate to eliminate an attractive Proposal if it could be in service shortly after the expected COD date. Accordingly, it was established that if a project could be completed by July 1, 2021, it would be considered as reaching a timely COD. Any project deemed not able to be in-service by this date could be excluded from further consideration. The construction timeline used for this determination was the normal completion times for the system components needed. The DEC T&D Team identified the transmission upgrades required for all Proposals analyzed. These upgrades were then evaluated and a determination was made as to whether the necessary upgrades could be completed by the required date.

The realistic COD cannot often be determined until after the network upgrade equipment requirements have been established. The causal connection between upgrades needed and the time required to construct will be further discussed in more depth below.

## **5. DEC Base Case**

The DEC base case was formulated by excluding all combined cycle plants bid before October 9, 2018 that did not have an executed Interconnection Agreement. Subsequent studies of any plants excluded from the base case were adjusted such that those generators were not responsible for the costs associated with the upgrades caused by CPRE winners with later queue dates/positions. All other queued projects that were not duplicates from the same project were included in the DEC base cases.

Four transmission planning regions existed within DEC. Due to the size of DEC's generation queue, four base cases—corresponding to the four transmission planning regions—were created. Queued generation on the seams of each region were included in the respective base cases so as not to mask potential issues. The approach of using geographical groupings (based on the existing regional planning responsibilities) to create multiple base cases allowed for a systematic approach to assessing the impact of additional generation in different areas of the system.

## 6. DEP Base Case

The DEP CPRE Tranche 1 Base Case included all non-bidding and late stage requests, both FERC and State, with queue dates through October 9, 2018. There was one exception; a gas-fired combined-cycle plant which had a mutually exclusive alternative. Thus, combined cycle plants Q398 and Q399 were included in the base case and Q428 was excluded.

Due to the significant amount of solar generation in DEP, impacts from additional generation span the entire DEP region. Thus, all requests in DEP were modeled in a single DEP-wide base case.

## 7. Distribution Base Case

The Distribution Base Case differed from the others in that each project was evaluated based upon the loading of the line to which it was connecting and the substation loading into which the line connects.

## K. COST ANALYSIS COMPLETED

The analysis approach evolved over time and was not finalized until mid-January 2019. The teams and the IA were in agreement as to the components of the required analysis.

### TRANSMISSION

#### 1. Standard Analysis Results Document

The format for the analysis report was proposed by the IA, tested, and was utilized successfully by the T&D Team as a way to document the analysis results for Proposals in the Competitive Tier. The following topics are included in each bid interconnection cost analysis:

- Proposal Information
- Study Purpose
- Study Conclusions
- Interconnection Configuration for the Proposed Proposal
- System Location of Proposed Proposal
- Analysis Structure and Assumptions
- Transmission or Distribution System Delivery Impacts
- Transmission or Distribution Facilities Estimate Including Upgrade Project Description
- Estimated Cost and Construction Time of Network Improvements

Individual analysis reports were completed for each Proposal in the Competitive Tier.

#### 2. Analysis Results for Each Proposal

The T&D Evaluation team received the Proposal ranking in late November of 2018, 7 weeks after the Proposal closing date. At this point, the analysis of the individual Proposals began. The analysis results were produced in three steps: Analysis Content, Analysis Process and Results, and Track Progress and Status for All Proposals.

### **3. Analysis Content**

The analysis content was driven by the bid analysis document. Each section of the analysis document helped to form the basis for the necessary network upgrades for each Proposal. To help the T&D Team understand and produce the required analysis and documentation of the analysis results, the IA met with the team approximately once a week. Each meeting had predetermined discussion topics that led to individual assignments, with results covered in subsequent meetings. These meetings began in February of 2018 and continued through mid-May 2019.

### **4. Analysis Process and Results**

#### **a. Evaluate in Ranked Order**

The process for determining costs for each Proposal started with their ranked order. Proposals that were highest ranked had the lowest Proposal costs and were studied first; each Proposal was analyzed individually.

#### **b. Apply Distribution Factor Test**

If a Proposal location was within a previously identified constrained zone, a quick test was applied to determine whether the loading of constrained lines was likely to be too high as a result of connecting said project. Bidding into a constrained area did not disqualify a Proposal from being selected.

The Distribution factor ("DFAX") is a measure of the percentage of a facility's output that flows on a transmission element. Three percent (3%) is a commonly accepted threshold in the industry for assessing whether generators, loads, or transfers may materially impact the flow on a line or transformer.

Proposals in pre-identified constrained areas were screened against a 3% DFAX threshold on constrained facilities. Proposals that had > 3% DFAX on one or more constrained facilities in a pre-identified constrained area were excluded from further evaluation. The basis for this exclusion was unrelated to any impact on the cost of the Proposal (cost of upgrade may be spread across multiple projects) and was solely based on the inability to address constraints by July 1, 2021. While CPRE did not prohibit submission of Proposals in constrained areas, CPRE supporting documentation (i.e. locational guidance) indicated that Proposals in these constrained areas would have an increased likelihood of being subjected to system impact upgrades based on the level of activity in the queue. Proposals that did not have > 3% DFAX on one or more constrained facilities in a pre-identified constrained area were further evaluated, however projects whose necessary upgrades could not be completed by July 1, 2021 were removed from consideration.

#### **c. Apply Standard System Planning Models**

Both thermal overload and reactive capability analyses were completed using standard System Planning guidelines and models. The results of these analyses were reported in detail in the standard document for each Proposal. Four DEP Proposals completed bid analysis documents: two for distribution projects and two for transmission projects. Twelve bid analysis documents were completed for DEC Proposals: all were transmission projects.

**d. Determine Network Upgrade Equipment Requirements**

The analysis indicated whether there were any electrical deficiencies following the addition of the bid project. From there, the network upgrades needed to replace the deficiencies were determined. Standard unit cost tables were prepared based upon a project's completed history. The standard costs were then applied to each Proposal using the same costs for each construction unit for each Proposal.

**e. Evaluate Impact on Commercial Operating Date of Upgrade Requirements.**

After the extent of the upgrade requirements was known, the time taken to complete the field construction was predicted. It was important to understand this length of time when determining whether a Proposal could be operational by the time required in the RFP. The standard Proposal cost analysis document did not adequately recognize the importance of the construction timing requirement; the evaluation team suggests changing this document for Tranche 2.

**f. Complete Reactive Capability Evaluation**

The check performed by Duke Energy transmission planners was to confirm the plant design provided by the developer, or to advise the MP on the MW limitation.

Note that the DEC and DEP power factor requirements were published on OASIS in their respective Facility Interconnection Requirements documents. Developers were expected to design their plants to meet these requirements. The check performed by Duke Energy transmission planners was to confirm or correct the plant design provided by the developer.

The Evaluation Team also conducted a reactive capability evaluation. The following is an example of language used in one of the reports; "The maximum allowable size for a capacitor bank associated with a facility was 3.3 Mega-Volt Amperes Reactive ("MVAR"), which allowed the MP to compensate only for plant losses. With or without a 3.3 MVAR capacitor bank installed and in service, the requested MW output met the reactive" capability requirements set forth in DEC's FCR document, and the reactive power range was between 8.9 MVAR lagging and 5.6 MVAR leading.

**g. Track Progress and Status for All Proposals**

During the Proposal cost evaluation process, it was necessary to track status and progress for each individual Proposal. Individual records were maintained for DEC and for DEP. For all evaluation participants to have equal access to the same data, these files were maintained centrally and made available to authorized individuals on a regular basis.

**DISTRIBUTION**

As discussed below, there were three distribution Proposals that were bid into DEP: 67-01, 67-02, and 83-04. There was one such Proposal in DEC: 118-04. The process for considering distribution Proposals differs from the method that was used for transmission Proposals and will be covered separately below.

## **1. Analysis of Distribution Content**

The distribution Proposals were restricted to a maximum of 20 MW and were required to connect at a distribution voltage. Because of their smaller size, distribution projects fit into more locations on the electric system. Thus, these projects were evaluated on the impact that they would make on a single circuit or on a single substation. Once the Proposal location was known, the analysis of electrical impact could begin. Distribution Proposals were also evaluated for their power flow impact on the transmission system. The same report document outline used for transmission was also used for distribution, but the smaller sizes of the distribution Proposals led to differences in analysis content and emphasis.

## **2. Distribution Analysis Process**

The Distribution evaluation team had only four Proposals to evaluate. Coupled with the smaller amount of required analysis, this resulted in a significantly smaller workload. To assist in providing guidance for the Distribution team, the IA participated in team meetings approximately every other week. Discussion topics were prepared by the IA, which led to specific assignments and follow up items.

The overall analysis process, despite its smaller scope, was quite similar to that followed by the T&D Team. For example, the distribution analysis process was driven by the documentation requirements of the analysis template. The Distribution team was the first to thoroughly test the viability of the analysis document format.

## **L. VERIFICATION OF COST ANALYSIS RESULTS**

One of the IA's critical responsibilities was ensuring that all MPs were treated justly and evenly. Additionally, the analysis process needed to align with industry standards and conform to normal evaluation processes used by Duke. The verification process began once all bid evaluation results were available. In mid-April 2019, the IA sent a request for in-depth verification data to both the Transmission and Distribution analysis teams, and the subsequent verifications occurred separately.

### **TRANSMISSION ANALYSIS VERIFICATION**

As a part of the verification process, the Evaluation teams, through the IA, made informational requests of the MPs and used their responses to develop transmission network upgrade costs specific to each individual bidder. These requests were organized to investigate three main issues: Basis for Standard Costs, Testing of Load Flow Results, and Distribution Factor Validation.

#### **1. Basis for Standard Costs**

A review of the standard cost units applied to the network upgrade costs for the individual Proposals showed that "Modify Relay and Communication Equipment" was by far the most used cost. Thus, it was selected as the unit for more in-depth analysis.

DEP transmission Proposals did not have any upgrade cost adders for the two Proposals analyzed. Therefore, the focus was on DEC for this analysis. In the 12 winning DEC Proposals, the cost for communication equipment applied to the Proposals differed as follows:

- 4 Proposals connecting at 100 kV had costs of \$225 K
- 1 Proposal connecting at 44 kV had a cost of \$192 K
- 6 Proposals connecting at 100 kV had costs of \$450 K

A request was made of the T&D Team to provide an explanation of these differences. Their response is provided below:

*Only 2 of the 12 bids (83-06, 83-07) had scoped estimates since they had completed Facilities Study (and an executed IA). The other 10 bids relied on the standard cost template—for which there isn't really a "standard" cost when it comes to relay/communication modifications since those are project and station specific. The per station estimate in the standard cost template is high more often than not but does not exceed the per station estimate associated with 83-07. Furthermore, some of the bids are on radial lines and others are on network (or network capable) lines, which influences the number of stations to which project may need communication. For the purpose of CPRE, a \$225 K estimate is indicative of communication needs to a single station, whereas a \$450 K estimate is indicative of communication needs to two stations. Any other estimates are indicative of a scoped estimate rather than an estimate based on the standard cost template.*

As solar projects completed Facilities Studies, the relay/communication modification estimates likely lowered as a result of having more points of data. Nonetheless, any estimate was subject to project/station specific variance that could not be determined until detailed scoping and estimating has occurred, which did not happen until after a System Impact Study was performed. Recent Facilities Study Estimates are provided in Figure 38.

The above explanation speaks to the variability of communication costs and showed that in many cases modifications were needed at multiple stations. The table provided illustrates actual data was variable but within the range of the standard cost for the "Modify Relay and Communication Equipment Standard".

## 2. Testing of Load Flow Results

A second area that was identified for more intensive investigation was the load flow results for two Proposals, one Proposal (143-05) that was selected as a winning bid and one Proposal (234-02) that

Figure 38

Queue #	Estimate
NC2017-03020	\$73,569
NC2017-03020	\$73,569
NC2017-03016	\$52,728
NC2017-03016	\$52,728
NC2017-03009	\$57,380
NC2017-03009	\$72,702
NC2017-02981	\$25,742
NC2017-02981	\$25,742
NC2017-02980	\$38,924
NC2017-02980	\$38,924
NC2016-02976	\$117,450
3164	\$96,689
3164	\$126,241
3164	\$110,437
8346	\$141,620
10191	\$117,321
10191	\$100,120
10191	\$83,274
42690	\$95,508
42690	\$95,855
42696-01	\$423,844
42893-01	\$76,520
42893-01	\$42,435

was not selected as a winning bid. A request was made by the IA to provide the load flow results for Proposal 143-05. An excerpt of the provided load flow is shown in Figure 39.

Each line of the table contains information associated with an identified contingency; the green area includes Proposal 143-05, and the blue area contains the base case data. The “% Diff” column contains a calculation that provides a delta between the individual contingencies with and without the addition of the generation addition of Proposal 143-05. Note the little difference and thus little system impact as a result of the addition of this Proposal.

Figure 39

2021s CPRE 143-05						2021s CPRE Base					% Diff.
New Rating	Rating	Pre-Cont	Post-Cont	Percent	Occurrences	Rating	Pre-Cont	Post-Cont	Percent	Occurrences	
117	117	95.3	106.3	90.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
24.2	24.2	10.9	21.9	90.3	-	24.2	10.9	21.9	90.3	-	<b>0</b>
42.9	42.9	19.4	39.4	91.7	-	42.9	19.4	39.4	91.7	-	<b>0</b>
42.9	42.9	19.3	39.4	91.8	-	42.9	19.3	39.4	91.8	-	<b>0</b>
85	85	38.3	78.6	92.5	-	85	38.3	78.6	92.5	-	<b>0</b>
85	85	38.3	78.6	92.5	-	85	38.3	78.6	92.5	-	<b>0</b>
84	84	39.1	78.6	93.6	-	84	39.1	78.6	93.6	-	<b>0</b>
84	84	39.1	78.6	93.6	-	84	39.1	78.6	93.6	-	<b>0</b>
22.9	22.9	10.4	21.9	95.8	-	22.9	10.4	21.9	95.8	-	<b>0</b>
42.1	42.1	23.6	40.6	96.4	-	42.1	23.6	40.6	96.4	-	<b>0</b>
183	183	70.9	167.1	91.3	-	183	70.9	167.1	91.4	-	<b>0.1</b>
129	129	74.4	119.8	92.1	-	129	74.5	120	92.3	-	<b>0.2</b>
41.6	41.6	25.9	39.6	95.1	-	41.6	25.9	39.6	95.3	-	<b>0.2</b>
41.9	41.9	28.8	41.8	99.7	-	41.9	28.8	41.8	99.9	-	<b>0.2</b>
292	292	154.2	266.7	90.4	-	292	155	268.1	90.9	-	<b>0.5</b>
292	292	154.2	266.7	90.4	-	292	155	268.1	90.9	-	<b>0.5</b>
85	85	38.3	78.2	92	-	85	38.3	78.6	92.5	-	<b>0.5</b>
84	84	39.1	78.2	93.1	-	84	39.1	78.6	93.6	-	<b>0.5</b>

The losing Proposal, 234-02, was also examined for analysis accuracy. A report produced by the T&D Team shows the comment below for Proposal 234-02:

*The tap line that 234-02 (83-10) and 336-03 are proposed on cannot accommodate both projects. If both projects are built, the project deemed to have the later queue position or to be less favorable will have to upgrade nearly 5 miles of 100 kV with an assumed cost on the order of \$7.5 MM. Either project is also subject to constraints that have been identified on the DUK/SCEG interface that would require an Affected System Study with SCEG to determine potential adverse impacts on a neighboring system. The upgrades on the DUK side of the DUK/SCEG interface cannot be completed by 7/21.*

The requested load flow results for this Proposal, which are included below, illustrate the overload condition.

Figure 40

Monitored Element	Contingency	Limit	Flownit	
306001 3CLARK H 115 308584 3BIGCOWHEADP 115 1	CLARKHILL-JST_MCCRMCK	119	217.5	Clark Hill 115 kV
309800 3MCCORMICKPV 115 339150 3JST-SC 115 1	CLARKHILL-CH_BGCWHD	119	217.5	Clark Hill 115 kV
306242 BUSH RIV 100 308226 NEWBERRYPV(A 100 1	CLINTONB_ANGSB	65	106.7	Champion 100 kV
306242 BUSH RIV 100 308579 TRINITYPV 100 1	CHAMPIONWH-BR_NWBRRY(D)	146	234.8	Champion 100 kV
306232 3BUSH R 115 307892 3NWBYC6 115 1	NEWBERRYWA	79	123.5	Newberry 115 kV

The results shown on line 5 at the bottom of the chart indicate that the Newberry – Bush River 115 kV line would be overloaded following the addition of this Proposal.

### 3. Distribution Factor Validation

The previous section discussed the application of the distribution factor, specifically how any distribution factor over 3% was an industry accepted indicator of significant contribution. Continuing with the analysis of failed Proposal 234-02, the IA requested distribution factor calculation results for the Newberry - Bush River 115 kV line. The chart below shows the distribution factor calculation results for each of the five lines shown in the table above.

#### M. STEP 2 PROCESS CONCLUSIONS

Based upon the entire body of work that was required to complete the system upgrade cost analysis for both transmission and distribution Proposals, the following conclusions are offered:

- The analysis process was the same for all bidders, being evenly and fairly applied to all Proposal s
- The T&D Team successfully adopted the standard Proposal cost analysis report format suggested by the IA. Modifications were identified by the team and were incorporated into the final document. These modifications were made to tailor the format to Duke requirements and standard practices.
- All T&D Team members worked well and focused on the tasks required to produce Proposal cost analysis results in a timely manner. Sufficient resources were available to complete the required tasks.
- The IA felt that communication with both teams and with the Account Managers was open and honest with a joint dedication to achieving quality and timely results.
- The verification tests proposed by the IA demonstrated a firm foundation for accurate cost analysis.
- CPRE tranche 1 was an excellent learning experience. Participants were open to suggested modifications in approach and were willing to attempt alternative solutions. The resulting analysis process will serve as a solid foundation going forward.

## XII. SUBJECT MATTER AREAS

### A. LEGAL TEAM REVIEW

The IA's legal team performed several tasks for Tranche 1 of the CPRE program. Prior to Proposal submission, the legal team prepared a Site Control Acknowledgement Affidavit. Following the Proposal closure date, the Legal Team reviewed the following documents for completeness: Site Deed, Site Lease, Site Control Acknowledgement, Title Insurance Copy, Title Insurance, Title Insurance Report, Boundary Survey, Description of the Site, Easements, Environmental Studies, Facility Descriptions, Facility Permits, Other Permits, the Project Map, Project Map with Landmarks, and the Sitemap.

A compilation of this review was organized and submitted to the IA. Based on the Legal Team's review of the documents, the Proposals were scored by category as follows: permitting will be complete at the commercial operations date, project site control for the full term, and site control to the point of the interconnectivity. The Legal Team reviewed the above documents again for accuracy and to determine how they scored. A large portion of the Legal Team's time during the scoring process was spent reviewing easements for the transmission path and looking at leases and deeds to verify control coincided with the duration of the project.

### B. FINANCIAL TEAM REVIEW

The Financial review conducted for CPRE Tranche 1 evaluated the credit-worthiness factors identified in the RFP (see Appendix F, item 6 – "Credit Worthiness"). The purpose of the financial review, as stated in the RFP, was to determine the "financial assurances to meet schedule and milestones in PPA." The credit worthiness of a Proposal was assigned five percent of the Proposal score, equal to 50 points of the total maximum score of 1000 points.

The financial review compiled information from the Proposal including information regarding ownership, plans for Proposal and performance security, and credit ratings. The Financial Review was conducted on all Proposals that advanced to the Step 2 evaluation. Given that Proposal security was required for all third-party Proposals that were advanced to the Step 2 evaluation, Duke's credit requirements and potential damages were secured by the Proposal security:

*Proposal Security Amount represents a fair and reasonable pre-estimation of the damages due to Duke Energy..." and "represents a reasonable estimate of Duke Energy's losses in the event of (i) Bidder's withdrawal of the Bid following its selection for further evaluation in the Step 2 Evaluation Process, or (ii) Bidder's failure to execute the Agreement with Duke Energy for the Bid if selected as a winning Proposal or failure to provide Performance Assurance as required under the Agreement.*

The Financial Review assigned points based on the method of Proposal security selected by each MP advanced to the Step 2 evaluation. Credit-worthy MPs were assigned the maximum score (50 points). Non-credit worthy MPs were evaluated based on the various forms of Proposal security (cash, Letter of Credit, or Surety Bond) submitted to ameliorate credit risk. A non-credit worthy MP who posted cash for the Proposal security was assigned 50 points. A non-credit worthy MP who posted a Letter of Credit or a Surety Bond for Proposal security was assigned 45 points. Bidders who dropped out of Tranche 1 for failure to post Proposal security or for other reasons were not evaluated.

### C. PROJECT SUFFICIENCY TEAM REVIEW

The IA Project Sufficiency Team was responsible for performing a detailed technical evaluation of each Proposal. The technical evaluation included a complete review of the project design and equipment specifications as well as a review of the experience of the MP's Project Team. This due diligence review was completed to confirm that any project the IA recommended for a PPA was technically capable of providing the service proposed.

To begin the evaluation, the PST reviewed each submitted Proposal form and identified the "pre-coded" data fields in the on-line Proposal form needed for evaluation of the project. The IA created an Evaluation File system, which was then used to develop a file repository for the PST evaluation of individual Proposals. The "Custom Reports" tool on the IA website was utilized to draw relevant data from each submitted Proposal.

The PST developed five custom reports:

1. Generating Facility (technical description of the site)
2. Solar Design (design and equipment specifications)
3. Storage Design (design and technical specification)
4. Project Status Summary
5. Proposal Summary

The PST also reviewed documents uploaded to the CPRE website by MPs, which included:

- Description of the project site
- Facility Description
- Inverter Warranty
- Operations (project costs)
- Project Map
- PV Ongoing Maintenance
- Single Line Drawing
- Site Map
- Site Plan
- Solar Information
- Specification Sheet (solar panels)
- Storage Spec Sheet
- Storage Experience
- Renewable Facilities Experience

In its initial examination, the PST reviewed each Proposal and its associated uploaded documents to determine whether the response was "complete and conforming," that is whether it provided all of the required information and met the RFP criteria. The PST found a number of deficiencies or questions about the project design. For example, some of the MPs entered the total installed DC rating in MW DC instead of kW DC. In some instances, data entries were left blank or the information that was entered required clarification. In each case where deficiencies or questions were noted, the PST posted messages to the MP's confidential Message Board providing the MP the opportunity to cure or clarify the information provided. Ultimately, all of the submitted Proposals were corrected and deemed conforming. No Proposals were rejected in the initial review and no Proposals were withdrawn by an MP.

Following the preliminary ranking of complete and conforming Proposals, the PST proceeded through its evaluation in the Initial Tier Ranking order. All Proposals were reviewed for the sufficiency of the project, with projects receiving a full technical review as they were included in the Competitive Tier. This approach permitted the best-ranked Proposals to proceed to the Step 2 review without delay, and those drawn from the Competitive Tier Reserve were reviewed sequentially.

The PST completed the relevant sections or subsections of the Sample Scoring Sheet for each of the Proposals. The PST addressed the following subsections: Experience of the Project Team, Equipment to be used, Required Control Equipment, and Quality of Project Design. A complete breakdown of scoring requirements can be found in Appendix F of the RFP.

### **XIII. ACQUISITION PROCESS AUDIT**

#### **A. OVERVIEW**

The IA conducted an audit of the CPRE Tranche 1 Asset Acquisition program. The Asset Acquisition program was designed for Duke to acquire Renewable Energy Resources consistent with the CPRE requirements to be developed through either a Renewable Resource Asset Transfer plus Engineering Procurement and Construction (“EPC”) agreement, a Build Own Transfer (“BOT”) agreement, or a Renewable Resource Asset Transfer Agreement. The DEP/DEC team could submit Proposals<sup>16</sup> chosen to be sponsored from the Offers presented on the AA Silo of the IA Website, and projects to be developed directly by Duke. Proposals for direct development by Duke were required to be submitted no later than October 8, 2018, which was at least one day before other MPs. The deadline for developers to submit Asset Acquisition Proposals was October 9, 2018. Asset Acquisition Proposal were evaluated by the DEP/DEC team and if selected, were converted by the DEP/DEC Team into a \$/MWH price that was evaluated by the IA in the same exact same manner as other PPA proposals. The DEP/DEC team was required to submit its sponsored Asset Acquisition proposal via the IA Website on November 16, 2018. The time between October 9, 2018, and November 16, 2018 was used by the DEP/DEC team to evaluate the Asset Acquisition Proposals.

Proposals for sponsorship by the DEP/DEC team were identified to the IA and the Proposal data was directly transferred to either DEC or DEP, as appropriate. This transfer avoided errors in the transfer of data and ensured that each sponsored project was evaluated with data presented to the DEP/DEC team by the developer.

The DEP/DEC team selected five projects Duke would agree to acquire and sponsor in CPRE. Once submitted on the IA Website by the DEP/DEC team, the sponsored projects were evaluated using the same standards as all other Proposals. The IA’s initial ranking of Proposals was adjusted once the sponsored projects were received and evaluated.

The AA Audit focused on the review of the design and execution of the Duke AA program. The review of the Duke Evaluation process included meetings with the Duke DEP/DEC Team to confirm the data collected on the IA Website was consistent with the information necessary for the DEP/DEC team to review offers from developers during the development of the on-line Proposal Form and after offers from developers. The criteria used by the IA in the review of the Asset Acquisition Offers included confirming the Offer was in compliance with CPRE, whether the Offer would meet the Required Commercial

<sup>16</sup> To avoid confusion, “Proposal” is used for projects submitted in DEC or DEP. “Offer” is used for projects submitted for acquisition consideration.

Operating Date (“RCOD”), and whether the project was capable of operation within the CPRE requirements

MPs were permitted to propose a project for a PPA and also to be acquired by Duke. Part of the IA’s review included comparison of the five Duke-sponsored AA Proposals that were sponsored with the PPA submissions by MPs of the same projects. In every case when a project was proposed for a PPA by a developer and also submitted as a sponsored project for acquisition, the Duke-sponsored Proposal was found to provide greater Net Benefit.

## B. AUDIT OBJECTIVE

As a requirement of the Duke CPRE Tranche 1, the IA performed an audit of the Duke Asset Acquisition Offer evaluation, assessment, and selection process. This audit was to determine whether the offers submitted to the Duke DEP/DEC team were complete and compliant with the CPRE requirements for eligibility. Further, IA reviewed the projects selected for acquisition to determine whether the DEP/DEC team materially modified the projects before submitting them into the CPRE program.

MPs could elect to submit Proposals for a PPA to DEC or DEP, as an Asset Acquisition Offer conforming to one or more of the AA structures, or the MP could offer a project as both seeking a PPA and an Asset Acquisition Offer. Twenty AA Offers were submitted in the CPRE Tranche 1. Figure 41 summarizes the submissions.

Figure 41

	Asset Transfer with EPC	Build Own Transfer (“BOT”)	Asset Transfer
Proposed	9	7	4
Sponsored (DEC)	3	0	0
Sponsored (DEP)	0	2	0

## C. THE AUDIT

Subsequent to the submission of projects being sponsored for acquisition, the IA Audit team met with members of the DEP/DEC team for the purpose of reviewing the selection process. The review included review of the criteria for selection, identification of the ranking of each offer, why certain projects were not selected for acquisition, identification of any design change requested by the DEP/DEC team, and final contracts with each project selected for acquisition.

Duke provided the following information to the IA:

- Evaluation Methodology Overview: described the process implemented to review, evaluate and rank all AA Offers received. This included non-economic (technical) and economic evaluation criteria.
- Assessment process summary: rank ordered the 20 AA Offers.
- Selection process for each of the five sponsored AA Offers.
- A summary of Capacity Cost in normalized \$/MW AC, Total Energy in MWh, and COD for the 5 sponsored projects.

The IA also reviewed the non-economic and economic evaluation criteria used in evaluation and scoring for each of the 20 AA Offers and found the criteria to be appropriate.

### **1. DEP/DEC Team Evaluation Methodology Overview**

The DEP/DEC team developed an evaluation process to review, evaluate, and rank the AA Offers. This process included both a technical (non-economic) evaluation and an economic evaluation with detailed criteria and a point system to score each Offer. The technical evaluation was used to assess the Offers to determine if the Offer met development, technical, and quality standards. An economic evaluation was conducted only if the Offer passed the technical evaluation.

The criteria for the technical (non-economic) evaluation included:

- a. Status of site control
- b. Quality of system design (optimal DC/AC ratio, NCF, constructability)
- c. Design standards meet DEC/DEP requirements
- d. Zoning and entitlements/community outreach
- e. Site investigation/environmental studies
- f. Project schedule
- g. MP experience
- h. Status of interconnections

Each of the non-economic criteria had a ten-point scoring system. All scores were multiplied by five, with a total of 400 points available. A minimum score of 200 points was required for the non-economic evaluation. If the resulting score was less than 200 points, the Offer was eliminated, and an economic evaluation of the Offer was not conducted. If the Offer's score was greater than 200 points, a detailed economic evaluation was conducted.

The DEP/DEC team conducted financial modeling using inputs such as project capex, project production estimates, and project operations and maintenance cost. The economic evaluation was assigned a maximum point score of 600 points and the Offers were ranked based on the combined non-economic and economic score of the Offer. The offers for acquisition by BOT or EPC were compared side by side. The DEP/DEC team considered project risk, including but not limited to environmental risk, development risk, construction risk, cost and schedule risk. Eight Proposals did not pass the non-economic evaluation and were eliminated.

The final Offer selection was based on the combined economic and non-economic evaluations. The Duke AA Evaluation Methodology was comprehensive and balanced. The CPRE guidelines included examples of technical scoring criteria and the DEP/DEC team criteria were consistent with the CPRE program guidelines. The non-economic criteria for the technical evaluation, including the weighting and the scoring, were reasonable and appropriate to meet Duke's specification, standards, and quality for a Company-owned asset. The scoring and weighting were similar to the scoring and weighting used by the IA in evaluating and ranking the PPA Proposals; in both cases the non-economic scoring had a 400-point maximum score and the economic score had a 600-point maximum. The AA evaluation criteria were applied consistently to each of the 20 AA Offers.

## **2. Assessment Process**

The DEP/DEC team created individual Excel spreadsheets to document the evaluation and scoring of each Offer. DEC received a total of six Offers and DEP received 14. From the 20 individual spreadsheets the IA prepared a summary Excel spreadsheet of the 20 AA Offers in rank order that included the Offer scoring, the disposition of the Offer, and highlights (notable deviant scores) of the reasons for the disposition of the Offer. The Offers were ranked and scored as follows:

Figure 42

DEC					
Masked Offer #	Non-Economic	Economic	Total	Observations:	Disposition
111-11	210	420	630	Secured proper zoning and permits (2/10) - Status of Interconnection (0/10) - Economic (7/10)	project was sponsored
111-12	265	360	625	Economic Criteria (6/10)	project was sponsored
111-13	260	300	560	Status of interconnection (0/10) - Economic Criteria (5/10)	project was sponsored
111-14	250	120	370	Economic Criteria (2/10)	project was not selected to be sponsored
111-15	190	N/A	190	Site Investigation - Interconnection - Economic - (0/10) -	project did not pass non-economic evaluation
111-16	135	N/A	135	Site Control - Quality of system - Zoning Permits - Site Investigation - Interconnection Study - Economic Criteria - (0/10) -	project did not pass non-economic evaluation

Figure 43

DEP					
Masked Offer #	Non-Economic	Economic	Total	Observations:	Disposition
11-1	200	480	680	Zoning permit - Site Investigation - Interconnection status -(0/10)- Economic Criteria (8/20)	project was sponsored
11-2	295	360	655	Interconnection Status (0/10) - Economic Criteria (6/10)	project was sponsored
11-3	250	300	550	Interconnection Status (0/10) - Economic Criteria (5/10)	project was not selected to be sponsored
11-4	300	240	540	Project Schedule (0/10) - Economic Criteria (4/10)	project was not selected to be sponsored
11-5	325	180	505	Economic Criteria (3/10)	project was not selected to be sponsored
11-6	275	180	455	Project Schedule (0/10) - Economic Criteria (3/10)	project was not selected to be sponsored
11-7	210	240	450	Interconnection Status (0/10) - Economic Criteria (4/10)	project was not selected to be sponsored
11-8	225	180	405	Zoning permit - Site Investigation - Interconnection Status - (0/10) - Economic Criteria (3/10)	project was not selected to be sponsored
11-9	190	N/A	190	Site Control - Site Investigation - Project schedule (0/10)	project did not pass non-economic evaluation
11-10	175	N/A	175	Site Control - Site Investigation - Interconnection Status - (0/10)	project did not pass non-economic evaluation
11-11	175	N/A	175	Zoning Permit - Interconnection Status - (0/10) - Site Investigation (2/10) - Quality of system (3/10)	project did not pass non-economic evaluation
11-12	175	N/A	175	Zoning Permit - Interconnection Status - (0/10) - Site Investigation (2/10) - Quality of system (3/10)	project did not pass non-economic evaluation
11-13	125	N/A	125	Site Control - Quality of System - Zoning Permit - Site Investigation - Interconnection Studies - (0/10)	project did not pass non-economic evaluation
11-14	125	N/A	125	Site Control - Quality of System - Zoning Permit - Interconnection Status - (0/10)-	project did not pass non-economic evaluation

Since the evaluation was completed in a step function process where projects were eliminated due to the non-economic factors and only the technically viable projects were advanced to the economic evaluation, there was no need to re-rank the projects. There was no single criterion that eliminated an Offer, but rather a number of criteria that varied for each Offer contributed to an Offer's elimination. Eight projects were eliminated because they did not pass the minimal 200-point score in the non-economic evaluation. Of those eight projects, project site control and zoning was a common factor for their elimination. Of the remaining 12 Offers, 7 were not selected to be sponsored primarily because the project economic evaluation resulted in less competitive pricing. A total of 5 projects were selected to be sponsored: 3 projects in DEC and 2 projects in DEP.

The DEP/DEC team indicated that the only design changes or modifications made from the initial Offers were inverter selections. All MPs included non-company approved inverters in their original interconnection application, and the five Duke-sponsored Proposal MPs were informed that the inverters would need to be updated. The IA conducted a review and comparison of the Duke-sponsored Offers and the corresponding MP PPA and affirmed that there were no apparent design changes or modifications from the initial Offers, except for 11-1.

In response to the IA's inquiry as to why the Self-Build team selected only five projects, the Self-Build team indicated that there was a total capital investment that was authorized for CPRE Tranche I participation (self-build proposal and sponsored asset acquisition Offers) and sponsoring more than the five would have increased the likelihood of exceeding the authorized capital. The authorized amount was not requested by or shared with the IA.

### 3. Selection Process

Figure 44 presents the five Duke-sponsored Proposals.<sup>17</sup>

Figure 44

Proposal #	Total Energy (MWh)	COD
<b>DEC</b>		
111-11	159,546	12/31/2020
111-12	129,670	12/31/2020
111-13	166,675	12/31/2020
<b>DEP</b>		
11-1	196,557	12/31/2020
11-2	205,041	12/31/2020

As stated above, each of the five Duke-sponsored Proposals had a corresponding and competing PPA Proposal from a Market Participant for the same facility. There was no requirement in the RFP for an MP to offer the same facility design in its PPA Proposal for a specific facility, nor was there a requirement

<sup>17</sup> Proposal numbers are "blinded."

that an MP offer a PPA Proposal corresponding to its AA Proposal to Duke. In this instance, there was a corresponding PPA Proposal for each Duke-sponsored Proposal.

With the exception of one of the five Duke-sponsored Proposals, which will be discussed later, the IA determined that each Duke-sponsored Proposal was essentially consistent in design and anticipated performance with the corresponding MP PPA Proposal for the same facility. This review was accomplished through several steps including:

- Review of the AA Silo on the CPRE website (submission documents, cure documents, correspondence, etc.);
- Review of the materials provided to the IA by Duke personnel in response to this Audit;
- Comparison of the Proposal Forms for each Duke-sponsored Proposal with the Proposal Form for its corresponding MP PPA Proposal; and
- Review and comparison of the annual energy, load profiles, capacity, and capacity factor of each Proposal.

In this analysis the IA compared the essential components of each of the five “pairs” of the Duke-sponsored and the corresponding PPA Proposals. The purpose of the analysis was to determine any differences between the Duke-sponsored Proposals and the corresponding MP PPA Proposals since each was derived from the same facility.

The IA reached four conclusions from the analysis of Duke-sponsored and MP PPA pairs. First, in four of the pairs, the Duke-sponsored Proposal had a significantly higher Net Benefit than its corresponding MP PPA Proposal. Given that the capacities, capacity factors, and energy profiles were virtually identical with each pair, the difference in Net Benefit was entirely explained by the lower prices offered in the Duke-sponsored Proposal.

Second, in the fifth pair, the capacity of the Duke-sponsored Proposal and the MP PPA Proposal was consistent. However, the Net Benefit of the Duke-sponsored AA Proposal was greater than the MP’s PPA Proposal. The IA sought to understand why there was a larger pricing differential in this pair versus the other four pairs.

Third, the IA analysis of the fifth pair concluded that the energy and capacity benefits showed that the “raw” benefit (costs avoided by the Proposal) on a \$/MWh basis was virtually identical for both the Duke-sponsored Proposal and MP PPA Proposal. The total annual energy for the Duke-sponsored Proposal for this facility was 7% greater than the annual energy projected by the MP PPA for the same facility, thus providing an explanation of the greater pricing variance for the Duke-sponsored Proposal in this pair as compared to the pricing variance for the other four pairs in which the Duke-sponsored Proposal included the same quantity of energy as its corresponding MP PPA Proposal.

In summary, the energy profiles of the fifth pair were nearly identical resulting in nearly identical \$/MWh benefits for this pair regardless of the scale of the energy. The IA concluded that the higher quantity of energy in the Duke-sponsored Proposal reasonably explained the greater pricing differential in this pair as compared to the pricing differential in the other four pairs.

#### D. AUDIT CONTRACT REVIEW

The IA reviewed the status of contracts for each of the sponsored Proposals when the IA met with the DEP/DEC team and confirmed there were no binding commitments between the DEP/DEC team and the relevant developers. The DEP/DEC team confirmed that MPs were asked to submit a redline copy to the standard agreements provided in the RFP along with their AA Proposals. The DEP/DEC team confirmed that they had reviewed all redlined documents provided with Offers and would commence final contract negotiations when it was known if a sponsored Proposal was selected as a finalist.

The IA also reviewed the AA Silo of the Website for review of contract communications. This included communications in writing on the Message Board and communications contained in cure documents uploaded by the MPs. The written messages included the scheduling of, and action items from, several telephone conference calls between the parties.<sup>18</sup>

The IA Website clearly documented and preserved all such information exchanges and negotiations between Duke and MPs regarding such topics as:

- Commercial details including progress payments in the asset transfer contracts to establish the final negotiated \$/kW price of each Proposal
- PVsyst<sup>19</sup> input/output forms
- Reference projects of similar or greater size than the proposed project
- Development and construction scope to be performed in-house and to be subcontracted by the MP
- Complete and detailed financial information on the MP and its financing partners
- The existence of a Fee-in-Lieu-of-Taxes (“FILOT”) agreement in place with the authority having jurisdiction<sup>20</sup>
- An unredacted version of the lease agreement to allow Duke to confirm the structure of the lease

Based on this review, the IA concluded that communications between Duke and the MPs were well documented, unbiased, and consistent with Duke’s evaluation and ranking of Proposals.

#### E. ACQUISITION AUDIT CONCLUSIONS

The Duke AA Evaluation Methodology was a comprehensive and balanced process. The Proposals submitted by the DEP/DEC team were compliant with the requirements of the CPRE program. The evaluation criteria were applied on a consistent basis to each of the 20 Asset Acquisition Offers submitted. The non-economic and economic criteria, as well as the weighting and the scoring, were reasonable and appropriate to meet Duke’s specifications and standards for a Company-owned asset. Duke’s scoring and weighting were similar to the scoring and weighting used by the IA in evaluating and ranking the PPA

<sup>18</sup> Duke offered to share meeting notes from the telephone conference calls if the IA requested them.

<sup>19</sup> PVsyst is a solar photovoltaic preliminary design tool for use by architects, engineers and researchers.

<sup>20</sup> Duke stated that such an agreement is integral to determining whether the project meets Duke’s economic and project schedule requirements.

Proposals. In both cases the non-economic scoring had a 400-point maximum score and the economic score had a 600-point maximum. The five Proposals with the highest combined non-economic and economic scores were selected to be sponsored by Duke.

The DEP/DEC team provided the opportunity for comments on draft form agreements at the time MPs submitted projects for acquisition. The DEP/DEC team did not have non-negotiable pro-forma agreements for developers, as was done with the pro-forma PPA for the DEP and DEC solicitations. Similarly, there was no binding letter of intent or MOU that bound the MP to abide by the form agreement or hold their asset acquisition bid price. That shortcoming was highlighted when one MP withdrew the Offer behind a Duke-Sponsored Proposal on June 26, 2019: 12 days before the end of the contracting period. Because there was no binding commitment, the developer was not penalized for withdrawing the Offer, and the DEP/DEC team was without recourse to enforce the commitments received from the developer. As identified in the "Lessons Learned" section above, the IA and Duke will recommend improvements to the Asset Acquisition structure, such as a letter of intent or MOU between Duke and the developer of an Asset Acquisition project that will improve the certainty and clarity of the process.

#### **XIV. FINALISTS**

Twelve Proposals were selected as winners for DEC at the end of Step 2 on April 9, 2019. The projects ranged from seven MW to 80 MW for a total group of selected proposals totaling 515 MW. Two of those selected Proposals included storage. On July 8, 2019, one of the 12 winning Proposals for DEC withdrew. The identity of the MPs that withdrew are identified in Confidential Attachment 1.

After being selected as a finalist for DEC, one of the MPs indicated a desire to amend the PPA price bid due to changes in the cost of materials. The IA declined to permit the change. Subsequently the MP asserted the desire to withdraw claiming that Duke personnel affirmatively declared that the interconnection for the associated project would not be completed in time to meet the in-service date the MP identified in its Proposal. The claim was erroneous. The MP defaulted by failing to complete the PPA proffered by Duke. With both requests for the right to withdraw the MP requested release of the Proposal security. The IA declined to support the release of the Proposal security. At that time there were no longer any competitive and available Proposals in DEC to consider as a replacement. Therefore, the final result for DEC from Tranche 1 of CPRE is 464.5 MW of renewable capacity.

Three Proposals were quantified as potential winners in DEP at the end of Step 2. The RFP established that up to 80 MW would be selected, with the possibility of exceeding that amount by up to 5%. The selection of all three finalist Proposals would result in a total of 167 MW being selected, which was unacceptable. For this reason the IA recommended Duke accept two Proposals in DEP for a total of 87 MW. The best ranked Proposal was from a small project, which necessitated selecting the next best ranked Proposal in order to get close to the Tranche 1 goal for DEP. On June 26, 2019, Duke Energy informed the IA that the utility self-developed Proposal (which was a conversion of an Asset Acquisition Proposal) that was selected as a winning Proposal in DEP was withdrawing along with another utility self-developed conversion of an Asset Acquisition Proposal. The reason for the withdrawal of the DEP Asset Acquisition Proposal is described in the report above, that is the developer and Duke were unable to agree

on a final price for the project. The IA reviewed the ranking of DEP projects and immediately contacted the parties representing the next most competitive and available Proposal. They were able to proceed to contracting and executed a PPA within the timeline required by the RFP. Therefore, the final result for DEP from Tranche 1 of CPRE is 85.72 MW of renewable capacity.

## **XV. CONCLUSIONS**

The Tranche 1 experience identified opportunities for improvement for Tranche 2. While an improved process should produce an even more robust response from the marketplace, none of the issues identified in this report should be understood to be a fatal flaw in the initial program design. Indeed, the IA believes Tranche 1 was successful in establishing a viable process for competitive procurement of resources.

The IA is hopeful that the Commission, Duke, and stakeholders will embrace the recommended changes presented as Lessons Learned, and further implementation of improvements before the Tranche 2 Proposal date.

**APPENDIX A  
SAMPLE PRICE SCORING SHEET**

**SCORING SHEET**



<b>Bid Scoring Categories</b>	<b>Bid Score</b>	<b>% of Bid Score</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Individual Categories</b>	<b>Maximum Scoring</b>	<b>Section Score</b>
1. Price Score		60%	Includes fixed and variable bid costs	The price score will be calculated on the basis of the bid's projected total cost per MWH	600	
2. Project Development Criteria		15%	Respondent must show sufficient evidence of ability to provide services included in proposal for the contract term  Evidence of operational capability to provide proposed services	-Demonstrate that permitting will be complete to meet COD -Experience of project team -Project Site control for full term -Site control to POI for full term	30 30 50 50	
3a. Facility Project Characteristics		15%	Evidence of equipment designed to meet specifications	-Equipment to be used -Required control equipment (TBD) -Quality of project design	30 30 30	
3b. Transmission Project Characteristics			Interconnection Transmission Rights	-Submitted completed interconnected request and obtained a queue number	50	
4. Project Characteristics		4.5%	Value of Project Characteristics	Demonstrates ability to meet performance guarantee and liquidated damages pursuant to the PPA	45	
5. Historically Underutilized Businesses		.5%	Ownership by Minorities (to be defined)	Ascertain that at least 51% of venture is owned by eligible minority	5	
6. Credit Worthiness		5%	Financial assurances to meet schedule and milestones in PPA	-Confirms meeting all Duke credit requirements  -Project financing confirmed -Bond rating -Net tangible worth -Liquidity	50  /or/ 20 10 10 10	
Total Score	1,000	100%			1,000	

## APPENDIX B LOCATIONAL GUIDANCE

### Overview

Duke Energy offers energy services to approximately 7.4 million customers in the Carolinas, Florida, Ohio, Kentucky and Indiana. The Carolinas area is comprised of Duke Energy Carolinas (DEC) and Duke Energy Progress (DEP). The DEC service territory is approximately 24,000 square miles and serves 2.5 million residential, commercial and industrial customers. Primary transmission voltages in DEC are 500kV, 230kV, 161kV, 100kV, 66kV, and 44kV. The DEP service territory is approximately 32,000 square miles and serves 1.5 million residential, commercial and industrial customers. Primary transmission voltages in DEP are 500kV, 230kV, and 115kV.

### Carolinas Service Territory



## Planning the Transmission System

The analysis performed by Duke Energy in planning the transmission system is based on good utility practice and NERC Reliability Standards. The analysis is performed to ensure reliable service can be provided to all customers considering that outage events (lightning, car accidents, equipment failure, faults, etc.) that cause transmission and generation elements to be removed from service can and do occur. Outage events can impact the voltage levels and the power flows on the transmission system in ways that would stress the system beyond its capabilities if the system were not properly planned, resulting in customer outages or poor power quality. Addition of new transmission and distribution connected load and generation requires ongoing analysis to ensure continued operation within limits. When analysis indicates limits will be exceeded, modifications or upgrades to the system must be identified to ensure continued reliable operation. The decisions to upgrade or modify system elements are made by applying reliability standards on an equivalent basis to all interconnection requests, and selected solutions to system issues are identified to minimize costs to the total body of Duke Energy customers.

When a new generation project requests transmission interconnection, Duke Energy is required to assess the impact of the new generation on the electric system. The assessment identifies locations where modification or upgrade of the transmission system will be necessary to maintain reliable service to all interconnected electricity customers, including consideration of possible outage events. The assessment includes the impacts of distribution-interconnected generation projects, which also affect transmission system loadings.

As a result of analyses performed to date, Duke Energy has identified areas where modification and upgrade of the system would be required if generator projects in the queue were to be interconnected. The areas where proposed projects have already indicated a need for transmission upgrades are identified on the constrained area maps. In other words, projects already under consideration, located in constrained areas, have resulted in demands exceeding the transmission grid capability and, if they are pursued to commercial operation, will require additional transmission capacity. Any new or additional transmission or distribution interconnection requests submitted in these constrained areas, after those currently in the queue for analysis, will possibly contribute to additional upgrade needs that may add project costs.

The need for transmission system upgrades is subject to the final disposition of the individual projects, i.e., whether or not they are pursued to commercial operation. Thus, the need for transmission system upgrades can be subject to change as additional projects are analyzed or individual projects decide not to continue with the interconnection process. Therefore, the identification of constrained areas should be considered a snapshot based on conditions known at the time. However, developers of potential projects in the identified constrained areas should be aware that there is a risk of additional transmission grid upgrades, which could result in additional costs and lead time requirements for the project. This would include distribution interconnected projects, which also impact transmission system loadings.

## DEC Generator Interconnection Requirements - Overview

Transmission level projects participating in the DEC CPRE are likely to interconnect to either the 100 or 44 kV system. Unless a project is interconnecting directly to an existing 100 kV station, the project will interconnect via a tap to a single 100 or 44 kV transmission circuit. For 100 kV projects tapping a single circuit, this design will typically include a three-way gang operated air break switch in line with the main line and a breaker (or circuit switcher) on the tap line at the point of change in ownership. For 44 kV projects tapping a single circuit, this design will typically include a 4-pole bent in line with the main line, disconnect switches, and a breaker (or circuit switcher) on the tap line at the point of change in ownership. For both 100 kV and 44 kV projects, the design will include a transfer trip scheme for faults anywhere on the main or tap line.

Transmission level projects participating in the CPRE may be permitted to interconnect directly to an existing 230 kV station. Any 230 kV interconnections not directly into an existing station require the generation aggregated at a new station to exceed 120 MW.

For additional details, refer to the DEC Facility Connection Requirements located under Generator Interconnection Information at the DEC OASIS website<sup>21</sup>.

## Constrained Areas in DEC

For DEC, the constrained area map (Attachment 1) represents areas of the transmission system where there are either known transmission constraints that would be aggravated by increased generation or transmission constraints that are created by queued generation. These transmission constraints have been identified by either Transmission Planning or System Operations and have been confirmed through transmission studies of one or more generator interconnection requests. Transmission upgrades to mitigate the constraints already identified would exceed \$10 million, and lead time is dependent upon the scope of work but would exceed 1 year, and possibly be as long as 3-4 years. Generator interconnection requests in areas not identified as constrained may also require transmission upgrades, but transmission studies are required in order to make this determination.

There are three constrained areas identified in DEC. In Guilford and Rockingham counties, off-peak conditions can drive post-contingency thermal loading issues on 100 kV lines that emanate from Dan River. Increased generation in these two counties will make the 100 kV lines in the Dan River area more susceptible to both off-peak and on-peak loading issues. The other two constrained areas shown are areas on DEC's system with the highest penetration of queued solar generation. The six county area near DEC's southern border including Newberry, Laurens, Greenwood, Abbeville and portions of Greenville and Anderson counties has over 1600 MW of queued solar generation. The other is a three county area

<sup>21</sup> <https://www.oasis.oati.com/duk/index.html>

located near the DEC/DEP border including Chester, Lancaster and Union (NC) counties that has over 600 MW of queued solar generation.

A DEC constrained infrastructure list is available that documents the individual transmission lines and substations that are in the constrained areas.

Additional transmission line mapping information can be found at the Energy Zones Mapping Tool website<sup>22</sup>.

### **DEP Generator Interconnection Requirements - Overview**

To connect to the DEP 230 or 115 kV transmission system, a generating plant should be at least 20 MW in size. Plants between 20 and 100 MW will typically be tapped off a 230 or 115 kV transmission line. This design will typically include line switches added to the main line on either side of the tap, a single radial breaker in the tap line, and a transfer trip scheme for faults anywhere on the main or tap line. DEP will typically build and own the transmission tap line and the breaker station adjacent to the generator substation. To connect to the DEP 500 kV system, a generating plant must be at least 500 MW.

If the total generation at a single site (or within a one mile radius) exceeds 100 MW, then a full transmission switching station (e.g. a three-breaker ring bus) will be required. If the total tapped generation along an entire line exceeds 200 MW, then a full transmission switching station (e.g. a three-breaker ring bus) will be required somewhere on the line (location to be determined on a case-by-case basis considering specific local conditions). If a generating plant connects to a DEP switching station, the generator owner will typically build and own the radial transmission line from the generating plant to the DEP switching station.

For additional details, refer to the DEP Facility Connection Requirements located under Generator Interconnection Information at the DEP OASIS website<sup>23</sup>.

### **Constrained Areas in DEP**

For DEP, the constrained area map (Attachment 1) represents areas of the DEP transmission system where additional generator interconnections have a high likelihood (depending on ultimate development decisions) of causing transmission problems requiring significant, expensive, and long-lead-time transmission upgrades. The constrained areas were determined by Transmission Planning from prior studies and knowledge of the DEP transmission system. Generator interconnections in regions that are not identified as constrained are not guaranteed to be without transmission problems. Studies will

<sup>22</sup> <https://ezmt.anl.gov/>

<sup>23</sup> <https://www.oasis.oati.com/cpl/index.html>

determine if there are any issues requiring transmission upgrades caused by generator interconnection requests in areas not identified as constrained.

In the greater Cumberland and Richmond County regions of North Carolina, extending across the state line into much of DEP's service territory in South Carolina, significant solar generation additions in the 2014-2017 timeframe, on both the transmission and distribution systems, have loaded the DEP transmission system to its limits. Any new generation in this area will cause transmission line overloads. Identified solutions exceed \$100 million in transmission upgrades and would take at least 4 years to complete.

In the greater Brunswick County region of North Carolina, existing limits on the transmission system can cause limitations in operation of the Brunswick nuclear generators. These thermal and dynamic stability limitations require that the output of the Brunswick nuclear generators be substantially reduced following the outage of any one transmission line in the area. This includes forced outages or planned maintenance outages of transmission lines in the Brunswick County region. Any additional generation in this region would cause additional, unacceptable limitations in operation of the Brunswick nuclear generators without the addition of costly transmission solutions. The estimated cost of the identified transmission solution for this issue exceeds \$100 million and would take at least 5 years to complete.

A DEP constrained infrastructure list is available that documents the individual transmission lines and substations that are in the constrained area.

Additional transmission line mapping information can be found at the Energy Zones Mapping Tool website<sup>24</sup>.

---


### **Connecting Smaller Generators to the DEC and DEP Distribution Systems**

Guidelines for the connection of smaller generators to the DEC and DEP Distribution Systems are provided in the Duke Energy Method of Service Guidelines<sup>25</sup>. In general, projects between 10 and 20 MW may be able to connect directly to a retail substation depending the voltage class of the distribution circuit, the voltage class of the transmission line serving the retail station, and other specific local factors described in the guidelines. Projects less than 10 MW may be able to connect to a general distribution circuit depending the voltage class of the distribution circuit, the voltage class of the transmission line serving the retail station, and other specific local factors described in the guidelines.

<sup>24</sup> <https://ezmt.anl.gov/>

<sup>25</sup> <https://www.duke-energy.com/home/products/renewable-energy/generate-your-own>


### Attachment 1 DEC and DEP Constrained Areas



**APPENDIX C  
FLOW CHART OF STEP 2 ITERATIVE PROCESS**

**CPRE STEP 2**

 = Iterative Process



**ATTACHMENT 1  
TRANCHE 1 FINAL RESULTS  
Report page 3**

**DEC**

<b>Proposal #</b>	<b>Contracting Party</b>	<b>Parent Company</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>MWs AC</b>	<b>Storage Included ?</b>
<b>118-01</b>	Partin Solar, LLC	Southern Current, LLC	Elkin, NC	50	
<b>143-06</b>	Carolina Solar Power, LLC	Duke Energy Renewables	Cleveland County, NC	50	
<b>83-07</b>	Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC	Duke Energy	Catawba County, NC	69.3	
<b>60-01</b>	X-Elio Energy SC York, LLC	X-Elio North America INC	York, SC	30	
<b>57-23</b>	Sugar Solar, LLC	Cypress Creek Renewables	Yadkinville, NC	60	
<b>336-02</b>	Westminster PV1, LLC	Ecoplexus, Inc.	Rutherfordton, NC	75	✓
<b>336-01</b>	Oakboro PV1, LLC	Ecoplexus, Inc.	Oakboro, NC	40	✓
<b>143-04</b>	Carolina Solar Power, LLC	Duke Energy Renewables	Surry County, NC	22.6	
<b>83-06</b>	Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC	Duke Energy	Gaston County, NC	25	
<b>258-02</b>	JSD Management, LLC	JSD Management, LLC	Woodruff, SC	20	
<b>143-05</b>	Carolina Solar Power, LLC	Duke Energy Renewables	Cabarrus County, NC	22.6	
<b>DEC Total:</b>				<b>464.5</b>	

**DEC Winning Proposals that Withdrew**

<b>Proposal #</b>	<b>Contracting Party</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>MWs AC</b>	<b>Storage Included?</b>
<b>93-01</b>	Stanly Solar, LLC	Albemarle, NC	50	

## DEP

Proposal #	PPA Contracting Party	Parent Company	Location	MWs AC	Storage Included?
67-1	Cardinal Solar, LLC	National Renewable Energy Corporation	Marion, SC	7.02	
188-1	Trent River Solar, LLC	Silver Creek Intermediate, LLC	Pollockville, NC	78.7	
<b>DEP Total:</b>				<b>85.72</b>	

## DEP Winning Proposals that Withdrew

Proposal #	Contracting Party	Location	MWs AC	Storage Included?
95-2	Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC	Richlands, NC	79.8	