



CGAs Proposed Scoring Table to Obtain a Waiver of the Minimum Equity Standard

CGA submitted comments on the MES Waiver Scoring Table and related questions on February 22d. In those comments, CGA noted that it was in the process of working with its members to develop an alternative to the IPAs Proposed Draft Scoring Table. Herein, is CGA's proposed scoring table. It contains 13 criteria, or action items, totaling 60 points. This scoring table attempts to encourage industry actions to meet the MES that use the contractor and workforce programs, however, we are still learning about the training programs and what they offer so this scoring table is over-inclusive of actions, some of which may be seldom used. Therefore, a bit of flexibility is needed in setting the score for obtaining a waiver, which we propose as more than 35 points. Utility-scale project developers will primarily use EECs and contractors who hire EEPs to comply with the MES. This approach differs from ABPs who will primarily be local companies with their own installers and would hire EEPs. Therefore, it would be best to have separate scoring tables for utility-scale project developers and ABP project developers. CGA's scoring table is structured for utility-scale project developers; it would not be appropriate for ABPs because of the table's emphasis on EEC and de-emphasis of EEP recruiting efforts. All but two of the criterion proposed by CGA are modifications of the IPA's Draft Scoring Table Proposal. The remaining two criterion are based on criteria proposed by the IPA during the 2022 LTRRPP. CGA's Proposed Scoring Table includes a range of outreach actions to EECs as well as EEPs. CGA has also kept the IPA's "similarly situated" point deduction.

CGA would appreciate the opportunity to informally discuss the "similarly situated" criteria with the IPA to help refine how that criteria could be structured, as well as reach a mutually agreeable MES Waiver Scoring Table for utility-scale project developers.

Below is a side-by-side comparison of the IPA's Draft Scoring Table for a MES Waiver with CGA's Proposed Scoring Table for a MES Waiver request by a utility-scale project developer:

IPA DRAFT PROPOSAL		CGA Scoring Table Proposal	
Criterion	Total Points Possible	Criterion	Points Awarded for Action
		1. Written description/summary of utility-scale developers effort to recruit EEP or EECs prior to the start of project development	5
Collaboration with qualifying workforce training programs	4	2. Coordinate with three Contractor Incubator programs closest to a project re: a proposed RFP for an EEC	5
Maintaining a list of EEPs for future openings (ABP only)	2	3. Maintain a list of EEPs for future openings	3
Participation in job fairs	5	4. Participate in 2 job fairs identified in a list of IPA pre-approved job fairs	5
Evidence of outreach to EECs listed on ABP site	4	5. Send RFP Notice to EECs listed on ABP site	5
Posting positions or contract opportunities on and contacting EEPs via the Energy Workforce Equity Portal	6	6. Post positions or notice of an RFP on the IPAs Energy Workforce Equity Portal	10
Efforts to contact unions	2	7. Contact unions re: EEP positions that developer has available	3
Efforts to contact community colleges	2	8. Post positions with Illinois community colleges that have a training program relevant to the project	3
Efforts to contact community- based organizations	2	9. Coordinate with Clean Energy Prime Contractor Accelerator Program re: a proposed RFP for an EEC	5

Posting of positions or contract opportunities on different platforms	4	10. Post positions or notice of RFP on at least two different platforms per opportunity	3
Utilization of WorkNet or other state-run employment site	4	11. Post positions on WorkNet or another state-run employment site	3
		12. Submit with the waiver request a list of open positions or RFPs that the developer has not received responses, inquiries or proposals from contractors, EECs or EEPs, with an attestation of the lists accuracy	5
		13. Attempt to schedule a meetings to review the Developers RFP and provide guidance on how best to respond – outreach to at least 3 EECs	5
Number of similarly situated AVs that are able to meet MES	-5	At least 90% of utility-scale developers are able to meet MES	-5
TOTAL	35	TOTAL	60

This area intentionally left blank

Below is a table providing the rationale for the criteria CGA is proposing:

CGA Scoring Table Proposal	
Criterion	Rationale for Proposing this Criterion
1. Written description/summary of utility-scale developers effort to recruit EEP or EECs prior to the start of project development	This criterion parallels an effort the IPA proposed in its 2022 LTRRPP (at 333, item (i)).
2. Coordinate with three Contractor Incubator programs closest to a project re: a proposed RFP for an EEC	CGA has modified the IPA Draft Proposal “Collaboration with qualifying workforce training programs.” CGA has focused the criterion on a relationship the project developer would have with the Contractor Incubator programs. Utility-scale developers will primarily rely upon EECs and contractor employees to comply with the MES. CGA’s proposal is a specific level of action (coordinate with three programs) so as to merit the full point total.
3. Maintain a list of EEPs for future openings	Some utility-scale developers will hire local full-time temporary people to work on-site or in the project community. Those utility-scale developers would benefit from maintaining a list of EEPs.
4. Participate in 2 job fairs identified in a list of IPA pre-approved job fairs	<p>The IPA’s Draft Proposal includes “participation in job fairs.” CGA is proposing that the developer receive the full amount of points, therefore, CGA is proposing participation in 2 job fairs because this is a specific level of action that would merit the full point total.</p> <p>CGA also recommends that the IPA maintain a list of pre-approved job fairs, which could be updated at the IPA’s discretion. The alternative is that the utility-scale project developer can select the job fairs.</p>
5. Send RFP Notice to EECs listed on ABP site	The IPA Draft Proposal includes “evidence outreach to EECs listed on ABP site.” The IPA did not specifically limit this criterion to ABPs, in its proposal. CGA kept this criterion in its list proposed Scoring Table because it will take time for EECs to grow to a size sufficient to be able to construct a utility-scale project, however, the opportunity to work on large projects may motivate some of them to focus on rapid growth of their employee pool so they are able to serve the utility-scale market.

6. Post positions or notice of an RFP on the IPAs Energy Workforce Equity Portal	CGA believes the IPAs Energy Workforce Equity Portal will be the primary tool a utility-scale project developer will use to find EEPs, EECs, and contractors. Therefore, CGA proposes that it receive a higher point total than other criterion..
7. Contact unions re: EEP positions that developer has available	The IPA Draft Proposal includes “efforts to contact unions.” Unions would have potential EEPs. The utility-scale project developers who would hire full-time, temporary, on-site employees could benefit from contacting the local union hall.
8. Post positions with Illinois community colleges that have a training program relevant to the project	The IPA Draft Proposal includes “efforts to contact community colleges.” Community colleges would provide access to potential EEPs. The utility-scale developers who would hire EEPs for full-time temporary employment could be interested in hiring from community colleges that have training programs relevant to the open position.
9. Coordinate with Clean Energy Prime Contractor Accelerator Program re: a proposed RFP for an EEC	CGA has modified the IPA Draft Proposal “Efforts to contact community-based organizations” to focus on the Clean Energy Prime Contractor Accelerator Program, which is a community-based organization related to EECs. Utility-scale developers will primarily rely upon EECs (as well as contractors who employ EEPs to comply with the MES). The EECs coming out of the Accelerator Program are likely to have too few employees to efficiently build a utility-scale project, however, the opportunity to work on large projects may motivate some of them to grow their pool of employees.
10. Post positions or notice of RFP on at least two different platforms per opportunity	The IPA Draft Proposal includes “Posting of positions or contract opportunities on different platforms.” CGA is proposing that the developer. To merit the full points CGA is proposing that the utility-scale project developer post, on two platforms, positions available to EEPs or post RFP notices for contractors. Two platforms should be sufficient to elicit potential EEPs or EECs.
11. Post positions on WorkNet or another state-run employment site	The IPA Draft Proposal includes “Utilization of WorkNet or other state-run employment site.” CGA is proposing that the developer receive the full amount of points, therefore, CGA changed this criteria to the more specific action of “posting positions” on the state-run website.

<p>12. Submit with the waiver request a list of open positions or RFPs that the developer has not received responses, inquiries or proposals from contractors, EECs or EEPs, with an attestation of the lists accuracy</p>	<p>CGA’s proposed criterion parallels an effort proposed by the IPA in its 2022 LTRRPP (at 333, item (iii)).</p>
<p>13. Attempt to schedule a meetings to review the Developers RFP and provide guidance on how best to respond – outreach to at least 3 EECs</p>	<p>Utility-scale developer would meet with EECs to provide guidance on how the EC could best respond to the RFP so as to help grow the pool of potential EECs</p>
<p>At least 90% of utility-scale developers are able to meet MES.</p>	<p>I need more info about the MES compliance process to structure this strawproposal. It requires refinement such as which developers and when are they demonstrating compliance that</p> <p>As a general comment CGA members are concerned about this potentially penalizing developers who fail for reasons unrelated to them, like the contractor failing to find sufficient EEPs. CGA would appreciate the opportunity to work with IPA to refine this so it is more likely to be a gauge of an actual bad actor than penalizing a developer who had a few opportunities not swing its way.</p>

POINTS AWARDED PER CRITERION/ACTION

For each criterion in the Draft Scoring Table the tally for each criterion is “up to X points” or X points are possible. The IPA’s discretion to select the points per action creates significant uncertainty for a utility-scale project developer. Given the state of the electricity market, uncertainty in the # of points a developer can be allocated per action will discourage participation in IPA procurements; especially when the potential harm to the developer if, for reasons outside of its control, it is found noncompliant with the MES despite its best efforts. To manage this uncertainty, CGA recommends that the developer be awarded the full amount of the stated point total for a criterion/action if the utility-scale project developer performs that action. Therefore, CGA recommends that the action demonstrating due diligence should be well defined, that it be of a effort meriting the stated point total, whether it be recruiting EECs or EEPs. Developers are willing to put forth effort when they know such

