



Solar Workgroup of Southwest Virginia 2020 RFQ Questions and Answers June 30, 2020

1. Are solar gardens to be considered a part of this and is the SWG interested in pursuing development of solar gardens?

Community solar gardens can be part of this program, but do not have to be. We are interested in pursuing community solar gardens as a potential solution for building owners in Southwest Virginia.

2. Is there any additional detail on the workforce development piece, or intentions for the workforce collaboration that could be shared with respondents?

The SWG is actively working to develop local workforce connections and grow local capacity for the solar industry. We understand that different companies have different workforce training capabilities and strengths, and different workforce needs, so we welcome proposals that are aligned with your particular strengths.

3. It seems the RFQ is looking more for a solar installer w/ financing capabilities vs. a financing firm with solar install capabilities. Is this accurate?

Not necessarily. We would be happy to work with either type of installer/firm as long as both capabilities (solar installation and financing) are present.

4. Is there room for a pure financing firm play in this, partnering with a company that has the installation capabilities?

Yes, but we encourage Respondents to bid with a detailed plan for a strong installation partnership to ensure that projects will be built.

5. Could you let us know how SWG's RFQ related (if at all) to the Nature Conservancy RFQ process?

This process is entirely separate from The Nature Conservancy's solar RFQ.

6. Does SWG have access to different lands than does the Nature Conservancy, or are the two RFQ processes pursuing the same land for development in the same geographic area?

The SWG is prioritizing projects for customer-sited commercial-scale solar development. We do not have land that we are seeking to develop into solar projects. The Nature Conservancy's RFQ process seeks to identify a partner to develop large-scale solar on land that they own. It is unlikely that the two efforts/projects will overlap.

7. Will this RFQ process result in shortlisting participants or be the determining factor in which company you select to be the co-developer for the workgroup?

This is the final step in the process; we will select a partner based on the responses that are submitted.

8. What is the next step after this part of the process?

We will review the responses and score them based on the Proposal Evaluation Criteria and schedule video interviews with the top 2-4 responders if needed. The planning team will then select the winning respondent and inform the selected respondent in early August. The respondent will be asked to sign an MOU with the SWG PT. We plan to schedule a kick-off call with the SWG planning team and the respondent's project team in early August to determine the short term scope of work (6 months), and identify areas for the long-term scope of work (30-36 months).

9. Regarding the Appendix C Response Form, two questions: First, are attachments allowed for those answers that may be lengthy? Second, can we prepare a proposal using our company's template, but addressing all of the items in Appendix C, or do you prefer that only the form be filled in?

Attachments will be accepted. You may prepare a proposal using your company's template, but please be sure that it is easy for our review team to identify the responses to the questions necessary to assign point values according to the Proposal Evaluation Criteria listed in the RFQ.

10. Will the June 30th presentation be posted on the website?

Yes. <https://swvasolar.org/2020-rfq/>

11. The RFQ stated that you had a contractor/partner selected that would be interested in the installation portion. To what extent will the scopes of that contractor (local contractors) and the selected team's installation capability overlap?

That is unclear at this time given that we have not selected a co-development partner and no coal-field sited local contractors are currently providing solar services. The SWG will facilitate connections and partnerships between the Co-Development partner and local contractors as desired by both parties, but will not force or require partnerships between any two entities.

12. Have winning developers from the previous RFPs already earmarked projects in the region which are planned to go forward when market conditions allow?

Certain projects from the first two RFPs are still under development and may be constructed in the near future now that Virginia policy has changed. Other projects included in the cohorts from the first two RFPs have been abandoned by the developers and if the building owners are interested, the selected co-developer may have the opportunity to develop these projects. Outside of these projects that were included in the RFPs, the two winning developers from the previous RFPs have identified other possible projects in the region that they are working to develop outside of the scope of the RFPs and without direct involvement or partnership from the SWG, but the SWG does not have a full picture of all of the projects the developers are working on outside of the RFP projects and the status of those projects.

13. Can you provide an idea for the K-12 schools in the 7-county region: whether they have information on roof ages, types, and warranties remaining?

We do not have a comprehensive list of the status of the roofs for each K-12 school in the region, but all schools will have this information accessible. Generally, the roof condition or status varies broadly across the region, with some schools having been built or renovated relatively recently, and other schools likely in dire need of new roofs.

14. Could you provide any summary of discussions with the utilities in the region regarding net-metering and solar PPAs or is that information in the appendices of the RFQ?

Generally speaking, all relevant information is included in the appendices of the RFQ. One notable update since the RFQ was released is that Old Dominion Power filed an

objection to a pre-registration for a PPA project for a non-jurisdictional customer in their territory, noting that they do not believe the law requires them to allow PPAs for non-jurisdictional customers. The SCC did not rule on this specific issue, noting that ODP did not raise the issue in the correct venue. We expect ODP will file a request for declaratory ruling or other similar request with the SCC in the coming months. The same law applies to Appalachian Power's PPA program, but it is unclear if Appalachian Power will file a similar objection or request for declaratory ruling regarding non-jurisdictional customer PPAs. See more information here:

<https://scc.virginia.gov/docketsearch/DOCS/4nhp01!.PDF>

15. Will a list of pre-submittal meeting participants be posted?

We will share the list via email but not post it to the website.