



**ENERGY EDGE**  
strategic energy solutions

## **Question and Answers**

**for**

### **Request for Renewable Offtake Pricing**

**Cuyahoga Community College (Tri-C)**

**Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District (Sewer District)**

**Q1. Could you describe your motivations/goals in more detail? For example, would a new-build project be more desirable than an already operational asset?**

The primary goals for Tri-C and the Sewer District are long-term price stability, budget certainty, and meeting environmental goals. Having a new project would be a bonus and is not a mandatory requirement for a proposal. If there is an existing project available that provides an economic benefit the parties would be interested in reviewing that proposal. The entities are seeking projects delivering into PJM, not necessarily located in Ohio. The proposal should address physical delivery of renewable energy. The entities are not seeking proposals for virtual power purchases.

**Q2. Is a load-following product preferable over purchasing blocks?**

Entities are familiar with a load-following product and have traditionally purchased load-following products (where all hours are priced the same). There is an understanding that proposed



---

transactions may be structured as renewable power blocks. Tri-C and the Sewer District would be ultimately seeking a product structure that is delivered and invoiced as a load-following product.

**Q3. Is there a timeframe for COD?**

Current retail power contracts for both entities end in mid-2025. The Sewer District's contract expiration is May 2025, and Tri-C's contract expiration is June 2025. Mid-2025 would be the earliest time frame for COD. There is an understanding that proposed projects will likely start later beyond that time frame. Both entities expect to need to make another power purchase before taking power from a renewable energy project.

**Q4. Is there a minimum amount of physical RE needed? For instance, if 50,000 MWhs of RE could be used for this, could the remainder be filled in with RECs?**

The Sewer District and Tri-C are open to receiving all proposed solutions. Currently, the estimated annual power volume is 120,000 MWh. The preference for both entities is that this requirement is fulfilled from one project. There is an understanding that the requirement could be met by combining multiple projects. The evaluation team is seeking to evaluate all viable options. It is understood that during the term of the project, there may be a need to supplement power quantities above the expected annual volumes with renewable energy certificates (RECs) from another source. That situation should be for small adjustments during the term and not the means for providing renewable power to the bulk of required power volumes.

**Q5. For product structure 1, are they willing to take as-gen for a period of time?**

The Sewer District and Tri-C are open to all proposed solutions. Both entities are seeking options that will provide budget certainty, favorable economics, and environmental attributes to help achieve sustainability goals. The preference is to achieve this with little risk and exposure to spot



---

market pricing and volatility. It's understood that these projects come with risk and there has been a recent shift in product structures to balance the risk between developer and offtaker. It would be expected that the supplier that either purchases the project on behalf of the entities or sleeves the project will shape the product to remove most of that "as-generated" risk.

**Q6. Do the two offtakers have options to extend their electricity contracts beyond May and June 2025, especially if PJM queue delays prevent new build projects from being commissioned by this time? Our understanding is that is a 4-5-year backlog...**

Tri-C and the Sewer District expect to perform another power procurement beyond the mid-2025 timeframe to the time of COD of any selected project(s). The hope is that the project's COD will be within 2-3 years of that mid-2025 time frame and not have exceptionally long delays for the project start. The COD start date is not firm in this request and there is not a mandatory start date. The evaluation team is seeking proposals that meet long-term budget certainty goals. If the COD starts later than 2-3 years after 2025 and demonstrates favorable economics, the team will consider it as a viable option.

**Q7. Can you describe the desired structure and renewable asset specs for the Evaluation Criteria?**

The details of the evaluation criteria of the desired project structures and asset specifications are detailed in the RFP document. Overall, project economics is the highest weighted aspect of evaluation. The two entities would like to achieve budget certainty long-term at or below current forward power market prices. The preference is that the product is structured or sleeved as a load-following product to minimize the risk to volatile market conditions and contribute to the budget certainty aspect. The technology preference is solar and wind or a combination of two projects even if different types, wind and solar. The experience of proposers is also important and will be evaluated as part of the proposed solution. The two entities are very interested in all options and will consider all proposals it receives. The evaluation criteria are meant to provide a measured



---

method to rank the proposals and identify a path for recommendation. There may be the case that multiple proposals are considered by either or both of the entities as viable solutions.

**Q8. If an RE project could be found and presented to meet 100% of Tri-C but not NEORS (or vice versa), could an award be made with 1 but not both entities? I understand the intent is to contract for/with both.**

This is a possible outcome. The two entities intend to partner together to bring a significant load profile to market. Also, each entity has very similar goals and is leveraging the opportunity to work together to create a more efficient process for seeking these solutions. Either entity could select or not select a project to move forward. These are potential outcomes. The goal is to find an opportunity that is a fit for both parties and that a solution is identified to move forward. However, it is not a guarantee that a project(s) will be selected and that either party will move ahead with a renewable purchase.

**Q10. The schedule mentions needing to submit an intent to bid next week. Can you clarify what is needed for that? Would that be registering as a vendor for both NEORS and CCC, or would an email suffice? I checked both websites, and don't see a separate ITB form so I wanted to double check.**

The "intent to bid" request is meant to be an informal poll of potential proposers who are expecting to participate and submit responses. This can be an email reply and does not have to be submitted formally or through a specific form or format. There is no penalty for not providing an intent to respond and proposers that did not inform of prior intent will not be disqualified. It is simply a means for the evaluation team to measure interest in this RFP.

**Q11. Just have a quick question regarding the RFP. Are the Sewer District & Community College going to be contracting as two separate Legal Entities?**



Yes. The Sewer District and Tri-C will be contracting as separate legal entities. However, it is expected that the two groups will similarly accept standard terms and there will not be the need to provide two highly customized contracts.

**Q12. Under the Company Overview Section, For CRES Only: Number of meters currently served, divided among customer's major industries in PJM and total. Can you define "major industries"**

These would be high-level categories of customers served in segments such as Public Sector, Higher Education, Technology, Industrial, etc. The evaluation team is trying to gauge the proposer's experience working with commercial customers and where most of that experience lies by industry.