
**Response to Questions Regarding Request for Proposals for Technical Service
Providers to Develop Missouri's State Energy Plan**

December 19, 2025

The following abbreviations are used in this document:

- MoDNR-DE: Missouri Department of Natural Resources Division of Energy
- EIERA: Environmental Improvement and Energy Resources Authority
- RFP: Request for Proposals
- DER: Distributed Energy Resources

Question 1. Section IV, Scope of Work (pgs. 2-3): Can the MoDNR-DE confirm if the timeframe of the Value of DER Study timeframe in Task 1 is intended to align with the electric power sector modeling in Task 2 (Annual Results through 2050)?

Response: The study timeframes for major components #1 and #2 should align to the maximum practical extent. RFP responses must identify the study timeframe for major component #1 and, if applicable, why that timeframe does not align with the timeframe for major component #2. The selected study timeframe for major component #1 must align with the proposed analytic perspective(s).

Question 2. Section IV, Scope of Work (pg. 3): Can the MoDNR-DE specify if it anticipates the consultant to either a) conduct bottom-up modeling of electric demand drivers in the residential, commercial, industrial, and electric vehicle sectors that would incorporate anticipated sectoral trends, or b) rely on available load forecasts such as MISO's Long Term Load Forecast?

Response: The vendor is free to propose a method for demand forecasting that they believe would best reflect Missouri's projected electric power sector demand. RFP responses must identify the modeling tool(s) proposed for use in demand forecasting, including how the proposed tool(s) provide the best available Missouri-specific approaches.

Question 3. Section VI, Agreement (pgs. 7-8): Can the MoDNR-DE please provide the General Terms and Conditions identified in Section VI, "Agreement", of the RFP?

Response: MoDNR-DE will provide the terms and conditions of the contract during contract negotiation.

Question 4. General: The SOW states a preference for Excel-based modeling. Please clarify the role that proprietary or software-based modeling can play. Can the consultant use other models and then provide all inputs and outputs in an Excel-based format?

Response: MoDNR-DE strongly prefers Excel-based modeling due to the transparency and flexibility afforded by that program. However, a vendor is welcome to propose non-Excel-based modeling if the vendor's RFP response can demonstrate that such modeling would produce better results (e.g., due to the need to handle large amounts of data). In addition, the vendor must explain how it will provide MoDNR-DE with non-proprietary materials that can be viewed using readily available software (e.g., Excel-based input and output files with links and formulae intact), as well as the opportunity to observe the modeling process.

Question 5. Task 1: In reference to the SOW Item 1) e. please clarify the intent behind the statement of "each selected DER" – does the Department envision selecting potential individual DER sites across the state and all utilities service territories, or is this meant to be a statement referencing different types of DERs in terms of underlying technology?

Response: The phrase "each selected DER" refers to different types of underlying technologies, configurations, and characteristics (e.g., rooftop solar, demand response for large loads, virtual power plants). However, valuation must also reflect spatial differences, which would include DER in different utility service territories and locations around the state.

Question 6. Task 1: Further in reference to the SOW Item 1. e, please clarify the intent behind the language referring to "spatial variations [of DERs.]" For example, does this refer to potential differences in sizing of DERs, locations in terms of geographic exposure (e.g. south- vs. north-facing rooftop solar or the relative westward location within the MISO footprint), location relative to nodal T&D infrastructure, or something else?

Response: Spatial variations in valuation must reflect DER located in different utility service territories and locations around the state, as well as different locations within a utility service territory if such differences could meaningfully affect results. DER sizing and geographic orientation would likely be addressed as differences in types of DER.

Question 7. Task 2: In reference to SOW Item 2.b, please clarify whether MoDNR-DE has preferred data sources or assumptions for modeling data center and manufacturing load growth (e.g., announced projects vs. speculative load, treatment of queue-based assumptions), or whether we should propose and validate these assumptions in consultation with staff.

Response: The vendor must propose its assumptions. If the vendor is selected, the assumptions will be subject to consultation with MoDNR-DE staff.

Question 8. Task 2: With respect to SOW Item 2.c, please clarify whether the generation mix scenarios are expected to be modeled within a specific market footprint or planning construct (e.g., MISO-wide optimization with Missouri constraints vs. Missouri-only modeling with exogenous imports).

Response: The vendor may propose whatever methodology would lead to the best, Missouri-specific results. The scenarios reflect changes to how resource additions would be addressed in the context of serving Missouri consumers, but how such resource additions occur must be considered in the context of interactions with other regionally relevant entities (e.g., generator interconnection costs, out-of-state resource construction cost differences). Given that the Southwest Power Pool also operates in Missouri and that Associated Electric Cooperative Inc. is not part of any Regional Transmission Organization or Independent System Operator, modeling limited to the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. alone would not be sufficient.

Question 9. Task 2: In reference to 2c, please clarify what is meant by 'current economic trends'.

Response: "Current economic trends" refers to modeling and assumptions built into the model that do not alter the fundamental characteristics of any supply- or demand-side options – i.e., a *status quo*, cost-optimized approach to resource additions. For those scenarios with added constraints (e.g., Missouri First), the *status quo* would only be overridden to the extent necessary to comply with the constraints (e.g., cost-optimized resource additions that must occur within Missouri).

Question 10. Task 2: In reference to 2c, please clarify if the new build options should also consider transmission options in addition to generation options.

Response: Including transmission options in the new build options is consistent with the requirement of major component #2.e.ii.

Question 11. Task 2: In reference to 2c(iii), please clarify if the intent is to limit nuclear builds to 4800 MW but all technology options will be considered as opposed to 2c(ii) where there are no specific technology MW constraints.

Response: The intent is to require that all new builds up to 4,800 MW consist of traditional and/or advanced nuclear power, with additions beyond the 4,800 MW threshold not limited to specific technologies.

Question 12. Task 2: In reference to 2c(v), please clarify whether the potential new build options include all technologies other than intermittent renewables.

Response: Yes, the potential new build options include all technologies other than intermittent power sources. Any resource additions must also occur in the state of Missouri.

Question 13. Task 2: In reference to SOW Item 2.e(ii), please clarify the intended treatment of interstate transmission capacity—specifically, whether this refers to existing transfer capability only or should include modeled transmission expansion under Tranche 1, Tranche 2.1, and MTEP25 processes.

Response: The vendor should project new transmission capacity without the inclusion of any projects that have not received full regulatory approvals. However, any projected capacity that is consistent with interstate projects pending approval should be explicitly identified as such.

Question 14. Task 2: In reference to SOW Item 2.e(ii), please clarify whether system costs should include not only the production costs but also the capacity costs associated with new generation capacity.

Response: Major component #2.e.ii refers to transmission capacity rather than system costs. However, the vendor's projections of system costs must include all relevant costs, including capacity and production costs associated with new and existing generation and transmission capacity.

Question 15. Task 2: In reference to SOW Item 2e (iv), is the rate impact limited to additions of generation capacity or should also consider expected MISO transmission improvements and any distribution related improvements for Missouri state electric utilities?

Response: Ratepayer impacts must incorporate not only changes to rates, but changes to overall bills. These impacts must include all model outcomes that would affect rates and bills, such as, but not limited to, new generation capacity, transmission improvements, and distribution system improvements. Any impacts due to projected improvements that are consistent with current, but as-yet unapproved utility or regional entity proposals should be explicitly identified as such. Moreover, given that the Southwest Power Pool also operates in Missouri and that Associated Electric Cooperative Inc. is not part of any Regional Transmission Organization or Independent System Operator, modeling limited to the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. alone would not be sufficient.

Question 16. Task 4: Regarding SOW Item 4.b(ii), please clarify whether analysis of state energy financing mechanisms (e.g., EIERA) should include comparisons to peer states' programs, or focus solely on Missouri-based mechanisms.

Response: The vendor may include comparisons to peer states' mechanisms if these comparisons aid in the description of a proposed Missouri-based mechanism. For instance, if a proposed mechanism is similar to an approach used in another state, the vendor could cite that state's mechanism, but the mechanism proposed for Missouri would need to be tailored to differences in the state's regulatory, economic, and political climate.

Question 17. Task 4: With respect to legislative recommendations, please clarify the expected level of detail for proposed bill language (e.g., conceptual framework vs. draft-ready statutory text).

Response: Draft-ready statutory text is the expected deliverable.

Question 18. Task 5: In reference to SOW Item 5.a, please clarify whether MoDNR-DE has existing publication templates or style guides that vendors are expected to use, or whether the vendor may propose formats for approval.

Response: MoDNR-DE has an existing style guide that must be followed. Publication style guidelines will be provided by the department.

Question 19. Task 5: Regarding the September 1, 2026 deadline, please clarify whether this date applies to final publication-ready documents or to Department approval, with publication occurring subsequently.

Response: The deadline refers to the vendor receiving final approval of publication-ready documents from the Missouri Department of Natural Resources.