



Request for Proposals
for
Proposition 39 Solar Photovoltaic Project

ADDENDUM NO. 1

4/5/2019

Prospective Proposers:

The following changes, modifications and additions to the Project Request for Proposals described below are made a part thereof and are subject to all of the requirements thereof as if originally specified. The Proposer must acknowledge receipt of the Addendum in the space provided on the Proposal Form; failure to do so may subject the Proposer to disqualification.

San Rafael City Schools
310 Nova Albion Way, San Rafael, CA 94903

Table of Contents

This Addendum consists of twelve pages and the attachments as listed below. Deleted Text is shown in ~~red strikeout type~~. Added Text is shown in **red underlined bold type**.

- A. PROPOSERS' QUESTIONS
- B. CHANGES TO THE RFP
- C. ATTACHMENTS (Added to folders on the RFP file server as indicated. *Note*: where indicated as "Replace", files released with this Addendum supersede all previous files with the same name and earlier dates.)
 - 1. Site Walk Attendee List (included with this document and uploaded)
 - 2. Attachment B2 Cost Proposal Spreadsheet (Uploaded to RFP Att B Folder)
 - Replace original B2 Cost Proposal Form with the following
 - 1) *AttB2 SRCS P39 Solar PV Cost Proposal FINAL REV2 2019-04-05.xlsx*
 - 3. Attachment D4 Geotechnical Information (Uploaded to RFP Att D4 Folder)
 - Adding new geotechnical report and CGS letter for San Pedro ES
 - 1) *San Pedro Elementary-Ninyo and Moore Geotech Report_Dec 29 2017.pdf*
 - 2) *CGS_01-CG3265-Review Letter.pdf*
 - 4. Attachment D5 Additional Information (Uploaded to Att D5 Folders)
 - Adding EV Charging folder to Glenwood and current EV Charge Network schedules for both individual site folders
 - 1) *190321 CEI EVCN - 25 W CASTLEWOOD DR - BASELINE EVAL.pdf*
 - 2) *190321 CEI EVCN - 498 POINT SAN PEDRO RD - BASELINE EVAL.pdf*

A. PROPOSERS' QUESTIONS

Item No. 1.1

Question: What is the total amount of Prop 39 funding allocation available for the PV project for these two sites?

Answer: The current Prop 39 Energy Expenditure Plan amendment allocation is for \$405,000 for each site, so a total of \$810,000. Proposers should assume the District will set aside 10% of this budget for contingencies. Proposers may offer a shared contingency if needed to increase base budget.

Item No. 1.2

Question: Can any of the Prop 39 funding be transferred to the other site, if needed?

Answer: Yes.

Item No. 1.3

Question: Does the District have any additional funding to contribute to the Project?

Answer: No.

Item No. 1.4

Question: Will the contractor be responsible for tree removal and is there a requirement for replacing trees that have been removed?

Answer: Yes, any necessary tree removal will be in the scope of work of the contractor. See RFP Attachment A2: Criteria and Codes, Section I.6. Currently, there is no requirement for tree replacement.

Item No. 1.5

Question: Can we assume underground conduit and pull-string will be installed by the on-site electrical contractor (Cupertino Electric) during the parking lot renovation phase? If not, can we assume a coordinated schedule to install the UG conduit while the parking lot is trenched and open?

Answer: No, do not assume that CEI will install UG conduits as part of their scope of work. If possible, District will negotiate this and selected solar contractor can provide a deductive change order if this work is removed from the solar contractor's scope.

Item No. 1.6

Question: Is a fenced roof required for the new electrical equipment, similar to existing electrical enclosure at Glenwood?

Answer: No.

Item No. 1.7

Question: At Glenwood, would the District prefer to cover the entire row of parking spaces and remove the two trees to the East, or start at the ADA spaces and leave the canopy short of the trees on the East?

Answer: The canopy should cover the new ADA spaces on the West end of the parking row and does not necessarily have to cover the entire row. If it is possible to design the system close to the production target without having to remove the trees to the East, that is preferable.

Item No. 1.8

Question: Please confirm that Cupertino Electric is under contract with PG&E to provide the EV charging, as well as the new ADA spaces/stripping and therefore that work is excluded from our scope.

Answer: Confirmed. However, solar contractor will be responsible for touch-up restriping or repairing any damage caused by installation of the solar canopies.

Item No. 1.9

Question: Can we assume that if we provide the specifications, Cupertino Electric will install the carport's underground conduit in their trench from the main service to the canopy area?

Answer: No, do not assume that CEI will install UG conduits as part of their scope of work. If possible, District will negotiate this and selected solar contractor can provide a deductive change order if this work is removed from the solar contractor's scope.

Item No. 1.10

Question: How and when do we get the pricing from Cupertino Electric for adding our conduit into their EV charging trench and how do we assure that they will actually perform per the stated price, specs and schedule?

Answer: See answer to Items 1.5 and 1.9, above.

Item No. 1.11

Question: Please provide electrical plans that show where the EV chargers and all associated conduits and wiring will be located. How will we be assured that the conduit does not interfere with our pier locations?

Answer: The EV Charge Network plans are only in preliminary schematic design phase. No electrical plans are available at this time. The District plans to work closely with the EV Charge Network engineers to establish exclusion zones for solar canopy piers and associated underground conduits and infrastructure.

Item No. 1.12

Question: Since the work is now being done on the parking lot at San Pedro, is there a soils report? If so, when can we get that (prior to bidding)?

Answer: Yes, see RFP Attachment D4 – Geotechnical Information in the RFP documents folder. Note: a more recent geotechnical report (12/29/2017) for SPES and a CGS letter for the current modernization work was uploaded to the D4 folder as part of this addendum.

Item No. 1.13

Question: [Since there is active construction going on concurrently at these sites,] what provisions are being made to assure that the other subcontractors will negotiate in good faith with us and allow us to do our work without interference? Will there be a Construction Manager that will assure us that other subcontractors will perform as promised and according to their stated schedule?

Answer: The District does have a construction manager for all construction projects and they will help coordinate all site work. Most of the active construction at both sites is scheduled to be complete prior to the solar project construction, so there should not be any conflicts with other contractors on the sites.

Item No. 1.14

Question: Kindly provide the demolition and build schedule for San Pedro.

Answer: There is not a current schedule available for the San Pedro parking lot reconfiguration and new utility service upgrade. The scope of the parking lot work this summer at SPES is to: regrade at the accessible stalls and accessible EVCS stations; replace the sidewalks along the buildings; install the new electrical service enclosure at the northeast corner near the trash compactor; install bollards and the concrete curb with fencing separating the bus land from the rest of the lot; and seal and restripe. All work is expected to be completed before the end of Summer break.

Item No. 1.15

Question: Can the DSA closeout and certification responsibilities be separated to specific scope delivery such as “all solar related DSA Closeout and certification”?

Answer: The District is open to this suggestion. This will be handled during contract negotiation with the selected solar contractor, if needed.

Item No. 1.16

Question: Who will be responsible for restoring and establishing vegetation?

Answer: The contractor. See RFP Attachment A2: Criteria and Codes, Section I.9.

Item No. 1.17

Question: Who will handle the SWPPP engineering, permitting, and installation?

Answer: The contractor. See RFP Attachment A2: Criteria and Codes, Section I.16.

Item No. 1.18

Question: Can glare studies be excluded or do we need to put in an allowance?

Answer: You do not need to assume an allowance for FAA glare studies. However, visualizations will likely be required of proposed systems to help District with public relations related to the project. See Attachment A1: Scope of Work, Section I.1, and Attachment A2: Criteria and Codes, Section II.4.

Item No. 1.19

Question: A2.IV.A8 states lighting configured for all areas in the “area of the work”. What qualifies for that area of work? Does trenching to existing electrical equipment qualify despite that the solar shade structure is not in that area?

Answer: See Item 1.51, below. Trenching/bore routes do not constitute lighting impact areas. Only area where existing lighting has been modified or under the shade canopy itself.

Item No. 1.20

Question: What is entailed in “host[ing] formal design review meetings with the District and their representatives...”?

Answer: The contractor is expected to coordinate and either come to the District to have the design review meetings in-person or conduct a virtual conference where all parties can actively view plan sets and comment in real time. Contractor will be responsible for meeting notes and correspondence.

Item No. 1.21

Question: Can the contractor change-order for a formal review of the 100% Design and subsequent revisions if, in good faith, the contractor has delivered 90% drawings to expectation?

Answer: No. See RFP Attachment A3: Submittals & Project Acceptance, Section 1.E.

Item No. 1.22

Question: Can we assume that we will have sufficient time to provide our pier and conduit layouts to Cupertino Electric and that they will accommodate our work by avoiding laying their (and our) conduit in a manner that interferes with our carport or electrical work? In other words, will the Construction Manager for this project be responsible for coordinating the various contractors even though those contractors are not under contract to that CM?

Answer: No. See Items 1.11 and 1.13, above.

Item No. 1.23

Question: Assuming that there is a CM for the projects can we assume that there will be a reasonable budget for Change Orders and the CM will have the authority to grant COs without the school board's specific approval?

Answer: No. The District's Senior Director of Capital Improvements will ratify any approved Change Orders with the Board of Education. Proposers should assume that the complete project budget, including any assumed contingency for change orders, should fall within the Prop 39 allocated budget.

Item No. 1.24

Question: Are bollards required to protect the EV Chargers? If so, is there a specification?

Answer: Yes. They will be part of the EV Charge Program scope and are not part of the solar project scope.

Item No. 1.25

Question: Will vendor scope occur in parallel or in sequence with other work on site?

Answer: Currently, other vendor work is scheduled in sequence. However, the District is exploring the option to schedule the EV Charge Network scope in parallel to alleviate site disturbance and conflicts between the two projects. Parking lot reconfiguration and PG&E service upgrades at San Pedro ES are scheduled for this summer and may be completed before solar vendor is on site.

Item No. 1.26

Question: Will the parking lot be restriped and resurfaced, before or after, the carport is built?

Answer: Before for San Pedro. For Glenwood, the only parking lot modifications planned are new ADA spaces associated with the EV Charge Program. That work is currently scheduled before, but see comment above in Item 1.25 regarding potential for concurrent site work.

Item No. 1.27

Question: Where and how are excavated soils to be disposed of?

Answer: Contractor shall be responsible for prompt removal and appropriate disposal of all spoils related to construction activities. Any contaminated soils shall be classified and disposed of at an appropriately licensed facility. See Item 1.49, below.

Item No. 1.28

Question: What recourse do we have if unsuitable and undiscoverable conditions are found?

Answer: The contractor may submit a proposed Change Order, per the Design-Build Agreement requirements. See RFP Attachment C1 for specific information on Change Orders.

Item No. 1.29

Question: How many design revisions are expected?

Answer: Up to four. See RFP Attachment A3: Submittals & Project Acceptance.

Item No. 1.30

Question: Do we need to recertify (UL List) the electrical switchgear?

Answer: If the PV system is designed to be physically interconnected via bus tap, all work shall be represented in engineered drawings and inspected and certified by a licensed UL inspector. Existing facility switch gear shall also be re-certified by UL.

Item No. 1.31

Question: Please confirm that the Proposing Team's combined experience will be sufficient to meet the Minimum Qualifications listed in the main RFP document.

Answer: Confirmed.

Item No. 1.32

Question: How many trees need to be replanted? Do the younger trees need to be replanted? Where will the replanting would be located?

Answer: See Item 1.4, above

Item No. 1.33

Question: When do you expect we will have access to the EV charging station plans?

Answer: As soon as possible. See Item 1.11, above, and EV Charge Program Schedules in each site's RFP Attachment D5 folder.

Item No. 1.34

Question: Can you clarify the criteria that the District will be selecting the solar contractor on? Is accelerated schedule valued?

Answer: The District will be evaluating the proposals based on the criteria outlined in the RFP. Cost, schedule, experience of the Contractor and ability to minimize impacts on the sites are of highest concern for the District.

Item No. 1.35

Question: Would the District consider painted steel structures instead of hot-dipped galvanized?

Answer: Yes, the District will consider this if proposed in an alternate proposal. The base proposal must respond to specifications and requirements included in the RFP. If you want to submit an alternate proposal, please include a cover letter outlining the specific deviations from the RFP requirements and submit a separate B2 Cost Proposals spreadsheet clearly labeled for the alternate proposal.

Item No. 1.36

Question: Are there single line diagrams available for Glenwood?

Answer: The District is working to locate the SLD. If available, they will be issued by a future addendum.

Item No. 1.37

Question: Will the interconnection applications (IA) for the San Pedro be transferable to the new service meter and SAID?

Answer: Sage Renewables has been in communication with PG&E and received verbal confirmation that the IA will be transferable to the new service and will not jeopardize the status of Time of Use period grandfathering, however we have not been successful at getting that communication in writing.

Item No. 1.38

Question: Will you make the site walk sign-in sheet available?

Answer: Yes. It is attached to this addendum.

Item No. 1.39

Question: Could you please clarify if you'd like 3rd party commissioning on this project?

Answer: Third party commissioning is not being solicited as part of this RFP. Full commissioning of the systems in the scope of the contractor. The District's energy consultant for the Project will be conducting commissioning verification.

Item No. 1.40

Question: Is there a minimum clearance requirement for the carport/shade structures?

Answer: Yes, 12 feet minimum clearance. Please see specifications in Attachment A for more detail.

Item No. 1.41

Question: Are there any special requirements for bird exclusion or hard deck under canopy?

Answer: No.

Item No. 1.42

Question: The first item in the Design Phase in Attachment A1: Scope of Work states that the contractor is responsible for developing and implementing a community outreach plan and participating in community meetings. When will that work begin and how many community meetings should we assume?

Answer: The District has already begun community outreach and engagement around both campuses. Notices were mailed neighbors announcing the project last week and we expect to coordinate a community meeting shortly after selection of the contractor. Contractors should assume participation in up to four community meetings with preparation of up to four photo renderings of the proposed systems.

Item No. 1.43

Question: Is the educational component required or optional?

Answer: It is optional.

Item No. 1.44

Question: The RFP asks for an educational component to augment our proposal and there is a section for it on the B1 Proposal Form, but we do not see a place to enter separate line item cost for it on the B2 Cost Proposal Form. How should we handle the cost of the educational component?

Answer: The revised B2 form with the date of April 5th has an extra tab for the optional educational component cost. It has been uploaded to the RFP Attachment B folder and supersedes the previous version. Please use this form for your proposal and include the cost, if there is one.

Item No. 1.45

Question: Would the District consider an accelerated schedule?

Answer: Yes. The District would like to accelerate the schedule, wherever feasibly possible.

Item No. 1.46

Question: Can we assume we can build during the school year?

Answer: The District would like to limit heavy construction and full control of parking area under the array to school breaks or times when students are out. This is especially important to the District at San Pedro ES.

CHANGES TO THE RFP

Item No. 1.47

Make the following changes to Table 1-1: Project Milestone Schedule, on Page 2 of the RFP:

Event	Time	Date
RFP Published		March 25, 2019
Pre-Proposal Conference & Site Walk Registration	5:00 pm PDT	March 27, 2019
Mandatory Pre-Proposal Conference & Site Walk Location: <u>Glenwood Elementary School,</u> <u>25 W Castlewood Dr, San Rafael, CA 949013</u>	11:30 am PDT	March 28, 2019
Questions from Proposers Due	5:00 pm PDT	April 3, 2019
Response to Questions & Amendments Published		April 5, 2019
Proposals Due	4:00 pm PDT	April 18, 2019
Potential Interview of Top Ranked Firms		April 18 April 25, 2019
Notification to Top Ranked Firm		April 26, 2019
Contract Finalized		May 24, 2019
District Board Mtg. for Contract Approval, NTP for Design		June 10, 2019
Construction Begins		November, 2019
Commercial Operation		January, 2020
Final Completion (no later than)		June 15, 2020

Item No. 1.48

Make the following addition to Attachment A1: Scope of Work, Section I:

5. Due diligence activities for all sites shall include, but are not limited to: Title report(s), ALTA survey(s), topographical survey, civil survey, electrical survey, geo-technical study and report, soils contamination testing, USA, ground penetrating radar, environmental and/or biological surveys per CEQA and or EIR, glare study (when appropriate), UXO assessment etc..

Item No. 1.49

Make the following addition to Attachment A1: Scope of Work, Section II:

21. Contractor shall be responsible for prompt removal and appropriate disposal of all spoils related to construction activities. Any contaminated soils shall be contained and disposed of at an appropriately licensed facility per soils management plan prepared by the geotechnical engineer.

Item No. 1.50

Make the following addition to Attachment A2: Criteria and Codes, Section II:

6. If the PV system is designed to be physically interconnected via bus tap, all work shall be represented in engineered drawings and inspected and certified by a licensed UL inspector. Existing facility switch gear shall also be re-certified by UL.

Item No. 1.51

Make the following changes to Attachment A2: Criteria and Codes, Section IV.A.8.:

New design shall cover all areas of the parking lots **where existing lighting has been impacted by the solar canopies or within thirty feet (30') of the of the solar canopy drip line** ~~(in the area of the work)~~ to leave no dark spots and meet IESNA and requirements for all areas previously covered by light standards removed under this contract. Contractor shall install new pole mounted luminaires if canopy lighting does not provide sufficient lighting in all areas previously covered by removed or altered light standards. Existing fixtures may remain, if not in direct conflict with canopies or causing shading of new canopies.

- End of Addendum 01 -

San Rafael City Schools Prop 39 Solar PV Project

Pre-Proposal Conference & Site Walk Sign-In Sheet

Thursday, March 28, 2019
At 11:30 am

My name below confirms my attendance at all school sites. I certify that it is my responsibility to verify all site details and that I have access to the electronic documents distributed by the District. I further certify my understanding that if I need clarification of the information presented at this conference or in the RFP documents, I will request such clarification in writing, via e-mail to rfp@sagerenew.com.

Please Print

	Company	Your Name	E-mail	Phone
1	SunLight ePower	Gary Gerber	gary@sunlightandpower.com	510 845-2997
2	ENGIE Services	Louise Blavet	louise.blavet@engie.com	415-988-4426
3	Sprig Electric	Kelly Lund	klund@sprigelectric.com	408- 891-6156 891-6156
4	MBARC	Ken Riley	kenr@mbarconline.com	(760) 815-9405
5	SOLAR TECHNOLOGIES	TIM GLAVILLE	tglaville@solar technologies.com	415-845-1254
6	Pure Power Solutions	Jonathan Mooney	jmooney@purepowersolutions.com	707-843-1063
7	SUNTERRA	CHRIS BUMAS	CBUMAS@SUNTERRASOLAR.COM	415 265 5560
8	SUNTERRA	BRANDON MARENGO	WAKERIDER23@ATT.NET	925 383 7885
9	CUMMINS CONST.	WILLIAM GONK	Wgonk@ccarpusa.com	415 470 4256
10	SRCS	Dan Zeich		
11	BAY CONSTRUCTION	PAUL CAMPBELL	paul@bayconstruction.com	925-393-3571