

Questions and Answers

- Does Addendum #1 replace the scope in the RFP in its entirety, or does the RFP still apply to anything the addendum doesn't mention (cost of service, rate design, large-load analysis, growth-related fees, scenarios, affordability)? **Yes**
 - If the Comprehensive Utility Financial Planning, Cost of Service Analysis and Rate Design Study title no longer applies, what should we title the new study under the amended proposal? **You can simply call it Rate Study**
- Is staff training on the model still expected? The RFP asked for it, and the addendum says the analysis should be usable by BPW in future years. **Yes, unless self explanatory.**
- For the bill impact analysis, which customer classes and usage levels does BPW want, and does it want customer-specific analyses for major industrial customers? **Residential, Commercial, and Industrial. We can provide a bill with current rates for each. We are not looking at specific industries.**
- For benchmarking, how many peer utilities per service, and does BPW have specific peers in mind? **I believe 3 at a minimum for each service. We prefer to use Upstate cities and systems as comparison. On the electric side, obviously Duke and Broad River Electric as well as Greer CPW.**
- Are the November 3 selection date and the February 11, 2027 Board presentation unchanged? **Yes**
- How many in-person and virtual meetings does BPW expect, and how many presentations to the Board? **No set number. One presentation to the Board.**
- Is there a budget range or not-to-exceed expectation? **Not to exceed \$150k** What does BPW mean by "optional continuing services": annual model updates or something broader? **Yes, a price for annual model updates if the Board so chose.**
- Do the RFP's evaluation criteria and weights still apply? **Yes, except we won't be putting any emphasis on cost-of-service studies.** Are there page limits or required forms for the electronic submission? **None.**
- **Scope of work:** Our understanding is that Addendum #1 narrows the original scope to a five-year revenue sufficiency analysis for each utility, customer bill impact analysis, rate benchmarking, and a multi-year implementation plan, with a reusable financial model. Could you confirm that the more detailed cost-of-service studies, rate design analyses, large-load electric analysis, and system development/capacity fee analysis are no longer required? **That is correct.**
- **Level of analysis:** Should the revenue sufficiency analysis focus on identifying annual revenue requirements and recommended rate adjustments using existing rate structures, rather than developing new rate structures or allocating costs across customer classes? **We are not necessarily looking to change our structure, but if a review shows that another structure would be more advantageous then we would like to see all options.**
- **Deliverables and presentations:** Do the original requirements for draft and final reports, Board presentations, and staff training remain applicable under the revised scope? **Yes**

- **Implementation timeline:** Is the target for new rates to take effect April 1, 2027, the start of BPW's fiscal year? **Yes**
- **Fee and budget:** Has BPW established a revised budget range for the reduced scope? Under the not-to-exceed fee, would BPW prefer time-and-materials billing, fixed fees by task, or milestone payments? **We anticipate costs to be no more than \$150,000.**
- **Proposal requirements:** Should consultants continue to follow the original proposal requirements and evaluation criteria, including the detailed fee breakdown by workstream, or will these be adjusted to reflect Addendum #1? **The evaluation criteria will remain the same with the exception that cost-of-service and large-load customers will not be considered. The fee breakdown should be reflective of the newly designed scope.**
-