



INTRODUCTION

The following question(s) were submitted by interested parties through email (delivered to MDPSC-NGEA-Storage@poweradvisoryllc.com). Some questions have been slightly modified for clarity. Please refer to the [FAQs webpage](#) of the NGEA RFA website for previously posted Q&A documents.

Q&A #3, originally published on January 8, 2026, has been revised as part of the Answer to Q3 of this Q&A #8.

Q&A

- Q1. Who will ultimately be the contracting party for the successful applicant? Maryland Department of General Services, the utility?**

The successful Applicant will receive payments based on its ESCC Price Schedule from the Escrow Administrator and make payments based on revenues from the clearing price established in PJM's Base Residual Auction to the Escrow Administrator.

In accordance with the Commission's January 9, 2026, Notice of Request for Comments for Next Generation Energy Act Requirements for Transmission-Connected Energy Storage Obligations and Commercial Relationships in the PC75 docket, various parties have made recommendations to the Commission that are currently under review.

- Q2. Could you please clarify your preferred bid submission approach for bidders that are proposing multiple size alternatives for the same project? Should bidders submit separate Attachment C1/C2 forms for each size, or could they include duplicated "ESCC" tabs for each size within a single form? Additionally, should a separate bid narrative be submitted for each size alternate, or is it acceptable to address and differentiate the different offers for the project within a single RFP submission package?**

Applicants that are submitting multiple alternative sizes for the same project may submit one Application package with the following conditions. Applicants should submit separate and individual Attachments C1/C2 (ESCC Price Schedule) for each project size, or each project that offers distinct parameters. Applicants may submit one bid narrative that includes all required information for the project and multiple size alternatives.

For attachments other than Attachment C1/C2, Applicants may submit one Attachment and differentiate the responses to submission requirements for each project size alternative. For example, an Application with multiple project sizes should distinguish any changes to the Community Benefit Agreement Elements within one submitted Attachment I. Stakeholder Engagement & Economic.



- Q3. In Question 1 of Q&A #3, the answer states that the ELCC/Capacity Accreditation value in the ESCC payment formula will be fixed. However, in the released RFA, it looks like it was fully removed from the revenue formula. Will it be fixed to the class-average ELCC value or will it be removed from the ESCC payment formula?

In the draft RFA the ESCC Payment Formula included an ELCC/Capacity Accreditation value. However, because the value was fixed over the ESCC Term, we elected to remove it from the ESCC Payment Formula in the final RFA. The ESCC Payment Formula itself no longer reflects an ELCC/Capacity Accreditation value. This is reflected in Attachment C1. ESCC Price Schedule – Standalone Storage and Attachment C2. ESCC Price Schedule – Hybrid.

The Answer to Question 1 of Q&A #3 has been revised to clarify how the ELCC/Capacity Accreditation value is considered in the RFA, replacing “Therefore, the Commission has accepted the RFA Administrator’s proposal to fix the ELCC/Capacity Accreditation value in the ESCC payment formula.” with “Therefore, the Commission has accepted the RFA Administrator’s proposal to effectively fix the ELCC/Capacity Accreditation value in the ESCC payment formula, thereby, allowing the ELCC/Capacity Accreditation value to be dropped from the formula.” Please refer to MD PSC NGEA Energy Storage Q&A #3 Revised.