



## CT Green Bank RFP for Power Purchase Agreements for Solar Projects at State of Connecticut Facilities

February 10, 2025

### *Answers to Submitted Questions*

#### **1. Question:**

For the Platt Tech project, is the school parking lot available for a solar carport, or are we limited to using the rooftops from the design site report conceptual layout?

**Answer: Proposers are encouraged to provide designs that maximize cost savings to the site owner. The parking lot area is available for a carport design if expanding the system size beyond the roof is of interest. NOTE: As stated in Exhibit A, Aesthetics are a concern for this agency. Bidders are to carefully decide on conduit placement and budget the project appropriately to account for (additional) cost if required to minimize conduit install. Additionally, respondents are to minimize conduit run and cutting of installed asphalt.**

#### **2. Question:**

In reference to Section 3.4 (Maintenance) of the Master PPA Agreement, which restricts the seller from scheduling maintenance between January-February and June-September, would the buyer be open to revising this clause? It seems unreasonable to limit our ability to perform necessary system maintenance for such an extended period each year.

**Answer:**



**The State is interested in maximizing system generation during both winter and solar peak periods. The language is designed to limit scheduled maintenance during these peak periods while still permitting essential maintenance when necessary to ensure the SEF operates reliably and in compliance with Good Utility Practice.**

**3. Question:**

Under the Master PPA Agreement, we propose removing the Performance Guarantee Liquidated Damages (LD) and instead paying the difference between the power the Buyer pays to the utility and the PPA rate. Since we are not fully replacing the Buyer's 24/7 power needs, we believe it is unreasonable to be held accountable for sourcing alternative power. Would the Buyer be open to this adjustment?

**Answer:**

**The above raised concern is addressed in Section 4.7.a of the Master PPA as a remedy if the Minimum Energy Output Requirement is not met: "Seller shall reimburse Client Agency for any amount of per kilowatt hour cost of such substitute energy which exceeds the Energy Payment Rate, provided that such per kilowatt hour costs shall be calculated as the sum of the Client Agency's volumetric supply, transmission, and distribution charges only."**

**4. Question:**

Is the Buyer open to having the 90% performance guarantee be weather adjusted with a year one grace period and 2-3 year rolling average?

**Answer:**

**As outlined in the RFP, proposers must review and be willing to accept the template Project Agreements "as is".**



## **5. Question:**

In the second Q&A document, it is mentioned several times that “Proposers should provide PPA pricing that represents their cost to provide the full scope of services in the RFP irrespective of the incentive value”. For the sake of clarity, does this mean that PPA rates bidders are to provide should assume that any incentive value, such as Netting RECs for School projects, would be assigned to the offtaker rather than the project owner? In other words, should the PPA rate bidders provide represent the 100% of the rate required to finance the project?

**Answer: Bidder should provide a PPA rate that includes all revenue they need to finance the project. That revenue could be provided by a payment from the offtaker, an assignment of the revenue from REC purchases under a netting tariff, and an assignment of all or a portion of the revenue from a buy-all tariff, or a combination of these.**

## **6. Question:**

Since bidders are asked to include FM Global, should bidders include linear heat detection?

**Answer: All Sites are insured by FM Global. Awardee is responsible for incorporating any FM Global required specifications into their designs, and for all coordination and approvals required by FM Global. However we recommend excluding non-standard FM Global requirements that are not included in their Data Sheets from initial project pricing. If these are required as part of FM Global’s application review, it can be incorporated into the project economics at that time.**

## **7. Question:**



Are Expansion joint drawings? If not, should we include or exclude mineral wool or expansion joint steel covers?

**Answer: All available drawings are in Exhibit A. All Sites are insured by FM Global. Awardee is responsible for incorporating any FM Global required specifications into their designs, and for all coordination and approvals required by FM Global. However we recommend excluding non-standard FM Global requirements that are not included in their Data Sheets from initial project pricing, such as expansion joint covers. If these are required as part of FM Global's application review, it can be incorporated into the project economics at that time.**

#### **8. Question:**

For the Site Agricultural Experiment Station, could you please provide a site map showing where all you would like to have the systems within the parcel? The design report shows only the roof mounted system.

**Answer: A secondary site report has been uploaded under Exhibit A – Site Information, in the Design Site Report folder. This secondary layout shows the area identified for a potential ground mount installation for Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station.**

#### **9. Question:**

Some of the sites (for e.g. Waterford, CT) do not have adequate hosting capacity at the nearest MV circuit owned by the local utility. Should bidders include costs related to do the interconnection upgrades (like reconductoring, poles etc.) in the proposed budget to bring in the new service? If so, can the Green Bank specify an interconnection cost assumption to levelized bids?



**Answer: Proposers are encouraged to provide designs that maximize cost savings to the site owner. If proposers elect to maximize the system design and factor in interconnection upgrades (where required), Green Bank asks proposers to outline the interconnection costs accounted for in their response.**

**10. Question:**

How are the roofs bifurcated for the Platt site? We are having a hard time identifying A & B on the school roof. Could you provide us with a mark-up highlighting the same?

**Answer: Two (2) additional site reports have been uploaded under Exhibit A – Site Information, in the Design Site Report folder. The additional layouts are provided to show the split in design between System A and System B. As previously stated, System A has an NRES award secured. System B will be developed using the green school carveout in NRES. If proposers decide to do so, the system layout for System B can extend beyond the roof.**