

Gloucester Township

Joint Solar PV Project RFP Responses to Requests for Information

RFI #1 – Is there any way we can also get copies of the electrical plans, roof plans, site plans, and site utility plans for each location?

Response: All building drawings that are available have been provided to potential bidders and can be viewed and downloaded via the following website:

https://www.yousendit.com/sharedFolder?phi_action=app/orchestrateSharedFolder&id=jinqjcBOR3aUJ4IM_sMIbYnj80aZrSGWvskrOKT6LHM

RFI #2 – Do you have a list of attendees for the June 28 site walk?

Response: No.

RFI #3 – Could you please request an underground utility location drawing for the locations with parking canopies?

Response: Please see Response to RFI #1 above.

RFI #4 – I wanted to get some clarity on Section 4.3 in the RFP document related to the 2 year maintenance or guarantee bond equal to 10% of the value of the performance bond. Could you please explain its purpose/structure, why a 2 year tenor, and why it is necessary in addition to the performance bond? What happens at the end of the 2 years for the balance of the 15 year PPA contract?

Response: The Township anticipates that the awarded bidder will be permitted to release its performance bond upon acceptance of the work after construction is completed. At that point, the Township desires to have a maintenance bond in place, in an amount equal to 10% of the value of the performance bond, to ensure proper system maintenance and to guarantee against defects in the contractor's work for the specified time period. Two years after commercial operation commences, while the contractor will remain responsible for all maintenance and repairs of the System, the maintenance bond may be released.

RFI #5 – I am inferring that Blue Sky Power was involved in the creation of the RFP and performed a detailed feasibility study. Is it possible to get electronic versions of any reports that were provided to the Township?

Response: No.

RFI #6 – Section 3.5 of the RFP contains detailed minimum requirements which will significantly limit the potential proposers on this project and appear narrowly tailored for a select few firms. These limits (such as projects managed in US/NJ, NJ Public Works Contractor Certificate and BPU Approved Vendor requirement and minimum financial requirements) will impact the quality and quantity of proposals received by the Township/District. Will the Township consider revising its minimum requirements to expand competition?

Response: No.

RFI #7 – Given existing economic conditions and the market projections for the SREC market in out years, the project will be difficult to sufficiently cashflow for financing purposes. Are there any other incentives the Township/Districts can undertake to make the project more viable/attractive to potential lenders/financers?

Response: None are currently under consideration.

RFI #8 – Construction risks certainly impact the bottom line for the project. Will there be significant restrictions on accessing the various project locations for construction and operation of the solar improvements? Inability to quantify construction risks could compel firms not to submit proposals.

Response: Construction access will require coordination with the Township and the Districts. The RFP requests that bidders propose Project timelines for consideration. The Township is unaware of any significant restrictions for accessing the various projects for construction and during operations.

RFI #9 – Section 5.2 identifies reimbursement funding to be included in the proposal. Is the amount identified in Section 5.2 negotiable? – the funding could be used for other project purposes such as expediting permits, etc. The set amount identified in the RFP may severely impact the ability to finance the project.

Response: No.

RFI #10 – Kindly explain the need for a bid guarantee? A bid guarantee is more appropriate in a purely construction contract – not a DBOM contract. A bid guarantee requirement seems counterintuitive and will place a successful bidder in a negotiating disadvantage in that a bidder's failure to complete a PPA, even acting in good faith, would cause the bidder to be

compelled to give up the guarantee. This is unfair leverage in favor of the Township which may not have been intended. Certainly, a guarantee is appropriate if the contract is awarded to a bidder and the bidder refuses to negotiate or goes bankrupt.

Response: A bid guarantee is required in order to give the Township and the Districts assurance that the awarded bidder will enter into a contract for the work.

RFI #11 – Are there any restrictions on partners (financing, construction, operations, etc.)?

Response: The only restrictions on team bids are those listed in the RFP document.

RFI #12 – Are contractors, consultants and others preparing the RFP documents for the Township eligible to submit proposals? This would appear to be a conflict of interest.

Response: No.

RFI #13 – Is it required to submit on the alternate bids?

Response: No. The Alternate bids are optional, not required.

RFI #14 – Is the roofing work noted on pages 44-51 of the RFP required to be part of the base bid?

Response: The roofing work noted on pages 44-51 of the RFP is required only at those buildings that are listed under the Base Bid on which bidders propose to construct PV arrays. Much of the roofing work listed in the aforementioned pages is for buildings included in the Alternates – if Alternates are not included in a proposal, the roofing work at those buildings is not required.

RFI #15 – Is it possible to exclude certain array locations/sites from the bid if it would be financially advantageous for the Township?

Response: Yes.

RFI #16 – Can you please provide the single line diagrams for Erial School, Gloucester Township Municipal Complex, JW Lilley School, Highland High School, CW Lewis School, Chews School, Glen Landing School and the Gloucester Township DPW?

Response: See Response to RFI #1 above.

RFI #17 – Should we stick to your specified area or system size?

Response: See Response to RFI #15 above.

RFI #18 – Do you need a minimum 10 year warranty on inverters?

Response: No.

RFI #19 – There is a shed/garage at Triton Regional High School, can it come down? Also, there is a passage between the two houses that leads to this garage, can we close this passage?

Response: For purposes of responding to this RFP, bidders shall assume that the shed on the referenced property can be demolished and the passage can be closed/secured.

RFI #20 – Can you provide us with electrical drawings for each location, for us to check the PV tie in point?

Response: See Response to RFI #1 above.

RFI #21 – Should we tie in your existing monitoring system at the Municipal Complex into the new one?

Response: Proposers may use their own monitoring system or tie in to the existing monitoring system at the Municipal Complex.

RFI #22 – Are there any issues/concerns with tree removal in the school’s courtyards where ever necessary? It is just specified on one drawing only.

Response: Bidders should assume that any tree removal necessary to provide unimpeded solar access to the proposed array areas will be permitted.

RFI #23 – Addendum #4 stated that the Chews Elementary School is Deleted from the scope of the project. Does this also include the alternates where the Chews School rooftop array was requested?

Response: Yes. Chews Elementary School has been deleted from the Base Bid and the Alternates.

RFI #24 – What usage load should we assume the new building at the GTMUA will have? What is the assumption for the reduction in usage for the Existing GTMUA building once the new one is completed?

Response: Addendum No. 4 included a Panel Schedule for use by bidders to calculate the projected usage load for that building. With regard to the usage reduction in the existing building, bidders should assume no reduction for purposes of preparing bids.

RFI #25 – For the GTMUA site are we tying into just 2 locations, the new GTMUA building and the existing GTMUA building? Utility data provided had 4 meters but are we only tying into these 2 locations?

Response: Updated utility information was provided under Addendum No. 5. There are 3 existing meters – one account was for lighting. Bidders should propose the most efficient and advantageous division of system output to the available meters. It is not a requirement of the RFP or Addendum No. 4 to tie the system into all available meters.

RFI #26 – In reference to the Highland Regional High School Roofing Scope of work: The building was designed with brick masonry and cmu back-up. The thru-wall flashings should exist at all rising wall locations; in most cases the weep holes are evident. Whether or not the insert counter flashings were removed should not impact the original thru wall installation as long as subsequent roof installations have not buried the original thru-wall flashing. We cannot determine where the wall panels should be installed. Please show the locations of work in elevation.

Response:

<u>Gymnasium</u>	<u>Addition Roof</u>	<u>Gym Lobby/Aux. Gym</u>	<u>Penthouse</u>	<u>Shop</u>
17' x 470'	21' x 12'	14' X 6'	28' X 7'	156' x 30"
4 – 2' x 4' openings	12' end cap	20' X 12'	7' inside corner	1 – 30" end cap
4 – 6' x 6' exhaust	110' x 5'	58' x 5'	2 D.S. brackets	
8 ladder supports	5' end cap	6' outside corner	45' x 3'	
18 gutter straps	4 – 5' miters	20' end cap	1 – 3' end cap	
	1 – 5' inside corner	5' outside corner	1 – 3' outside corner	
		5' end cap	1 in 3'	
			13'6" x 15'	
			8' x 5' window opening	
			8' x 7'4"	

RFI #27 – Based upon the site visit on 8/18, it was mentioned that there may be a possible bid extension. Should we expect one?

Response: No.

RFI #28 – Gloucester Township Municipal Complex—we find that the building is causing a significant amount of shade on the proposed site for the parking canopy. Is it okay to relocate the array to a sunny spot in the parking lot?

Response: For purposes of bid responses, bidders are required to utilize the designated areas for installations as shown on the RFP documents, Exhibit A.

RFI #29 – We need some clarifications on the Alternates - there seems to be duplications or we are not understanding the scope of the Alternates. Why are several of the schools repeated several times? We do not understand how to bid the alternates - please provide a clearer explanation.

Response: There are three alternate array scenarios proposed in the RFP. They include:

1. Blackwood School – roof array and corresponding roof upgrades (“Blackwood Roof”)
2. Timber Creek H.S. – roof array and corresponding roof upgrades (“Timber Creek Roof”)
3. Timber Creek H.S., Highland H.S. and Triton H.S. (the “High Schools”) – canopy arrays (“High School Canopies”)

The Alternates are combinations of the three alternate array scenarios listed above. Some Alternates are simply cumulative. The Alternates are described below:

Alternate No.1 – Blackwood Roof

Alternate No.2 – Blackwood Roof and Timber Creek Roof

Alternate No. 3 – High School Canopies

Alternate No. 4 – Blackwood Roof and High School Canopies

Alternate No. 5 – Blackwood Roof and Timber Creek Roof and High School Canopies

Please note that bidding on the Alternates is optional and not required.

RFI #30 – Can approved equals be approved after bid submission or are they required to be approved before submission? This is in regards to the Solar panels, inverters, ground mount, carports, DAS systems etc. As long as the solutions meet the specifications is that considered an approved equal?

Response: Approved equals can be approved after bid submission. If the equipment meets the specifications, it may be considered an approved equal.

RFI #31 – What is meant by page 5, #7 Consideration of Security? What is required here?

Response: The Township will evaluate the extent to which the bidders propose and/or consider site and equipment security as part of the bid evaluation. For purposes of this RFP, there is no specific requirement.

RFI #32 – Surety value - on page 12 it says 100% of the estimated cost of capital for the surety/performance bond but then checklist on page 14 item 18. Says Surety for 10% of the estimated capital cost? We would ask the 10% value be utilized?

Response: The bid bond is required to be 10% of the estimated capital cost of the Project (to a maximum of \$20,000). The performance bond is required to be 100% of the estimated capital cost of the Project.

RFI #33 – Are we locked into Protek for structures and if not do we need to submit our proposed structure for approval prior to bid date?

Response: No. Structures that are of similar quality to ProtekPark canopies, approved by the Township, are permitted. Pre-approval of equivalents is not required before the bids are due.

RFI #34 – I have not seen mention of ARRA compliance for Gloucester. Can you please confirm whether or not this project requires ARRA compliant major equipment?

Response: There is no ARRA compliance requirement associated with this RFP.

RFI #35 – To help us determine our bid amount, we would like to obtain an itemized breakdown of costs incurred for the feasibility study, the engineering analysis, the development of this RFP, and the projected costs for project management. Collectively, the RFP states that these costs are \$565,000, and are discussed on page 15 of this document.

Response: See Response to RFI #9 above.

RFI #36 – 7.2.2. PV Modules: The list of modules implies "Buy American." Are non "Buy American" modules acceptable?

Response: See Response to RFI #34 above.

RFI #37 – How many copies of the bid responses are required?

Response: Please submit one original and two copies of all submitted documents.