

*Bonita Unified School District
Request for Qualifications and Proposals
For Photovoltaic Solar Electric Generating Systems (November 18, 2015)*

Addendum Number One
December 18, 2015

By this Addendum to the above-named RFP, all RFP documents remain unchanged except sections or parts added to, revised, deleted and/or clarified herein.

This addendum consists of:

- A. Vendor Requests for Information (RFIs) and District responses (in blue).
 - B. An amended version of “Exhibit H: Solar Permissible Locations,” in which some of the sites’ solar-permissible locations have been modified.
 - C. An RFP schedule change.
 - D. Exhibit D of the RFP: *Solar PV Design-Build Energy Services Agreement*.
-
- A. Solar RFP questions (with District responses in blue).
 - 1. Please confirm whether the District or the City is the owner of the District Office/Transportation site. [The District is the owner of the District Office/Transportation site.](#)
 - 2. What entity is the Agency Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) over the District Office/Transportation site? [The Department of State Architect \(DSA\).](#)
 - 3. J. Marion Roynon: There are numerous challenges to building solar on the north campus including significant shading, ADA concerns in the parking lot, and switchgear issues. If the District is comfortable with some form of expanded shade structures in the south campus per our suggested layout that will really help. [Please see the amended solar permissible areas for this site in the Amended Exhibit H.](#)
 - 4. Section 5.1.7 specifies a kiosk requirement - is this requested for every site? Would a single kiosk available at District HQ suffice? [The kiosk requirement is hereby removed.](#)
 - 5. Exhibit G to the RFP specifies a preference for TMY3 weather data. Our analysis

indicates that Riverside Muni TMY3 data set is most appropriate for this project, however expected production will vary significantly depending on the selected weather set. Would the District consider level-setting the bids by specifying the preferred weather source, either this one or a different one? Respondents should use TMY3 weather data in generating their expected solar production figures.

6. Structure heights: Can the District specify the required minimum clearance heights for the various sites. Alternatively, we can specify what we believe will be required for each site given the final proposed array locations. The District/Transportation site should have a 14-foot minimum under clearance. In all other cases Respondents should use their best professional judgment in setting under clearance heights, taking into account the nature of the nominal activity under and around each PV structure. Where anticipated activities under and around a given structure do not introduce special height issues, Respondents should assume a 9-foot minimum under clearance.
7. Please confirm no additional consultant fees should be included in price or will be required from design-build entity. No additional consultant fees should be included in price or will be required from design-build entity
8. Is aluminum wiring acceptable? Respondents may assume aluminum wiring in their proposals.
9. Has the District confirmed if any of the sites should be ground mounts? And if so are the ground mounts to be utilized as the preferred option or only as a backup to shade structures to meet production targets? The District is not entertaining ground mounts at this time.
10. Will under canopy lighting be required for any structures NOT located within a parking lot? Respondents should assume under-canopy lighting for all carport, shade, and view structures.
11. For Ramona Middle School can the District please clarify what space is available for PV? The updated aerials attached to this Addendum #1 indicate the space being made available for PV structures.
12. What avoided cost should be assumed for the performance guarantee? 18 cents per kWh in Year One, and 3% higher than this in each successive year of the 25-year output guarantee period.
13. Who will responsible for the cost of the IOR inspector? The District will be responsible.

14. For PV arrays that are expected to be located over certain structures:

- a. Handball walls on blacktops – While the array can exceed the height of the existing wall, the vertical foundations are ~27-35 ft. apart and thus will not “span” the entire handball court. How would the District like to proceed for these sites? Respondents should make their best professional judgment as to column placement, taking the nominal activities in the area.
- b. Ball field Backstops – Certain sites show potential view structures where a backstop is present. Will these backstops be demolished, relocated, or built on top of? If demo or relocated, who will be responsible for these costs? Respondents should assume that the District will take responsibility for relocating or removing backstops where required to prevent them from interfering with the PV structures or shading of the PV modules.

B. Amended Exhibit H: Solar Permissible Locations. The amended Exhibit H is issued concurrently and is incorporated into this Addendum Number One. Respondents are directed to note any and all modifications in preparing their proposals.

C. The deadline for receipt of RFP proposals is extended from January 5, 2016 to January 8, 2016.

D. Exhibit D of the RFP: *Solar PV Design-Build Energy Services Agreement* is issued concurrently and is incorporated into this Addendum Number One. As directed in the RFP, Respondents must thoroughly review this Contract and (a) identify each and every term or condition of the Contract that the Respondent would seek to have modified or deleted; (b) set forth a clear explanation of any modification that is sought and provide specific alternate language; and (c) propose any additional terms or conditions that Respondent would want to have included in the contract along with a clear explanation of same. The District will review but is not obligated to accept any proposed changes.