

SOLAR ELECTRICITY PROJECT PROPOSER QUESTIONS AND DISTRICT RESPONSES

SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT

August 28, 2026

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District is providing the following responses to questions received from prospective proposers regarding the Solar Electricity Project Request for Proposals (RFP). These responses are provided for informational and clarification purposes. Unless expressly stated otherwise below, the RFP requirements, terms, and conditions remain unchanged. No acknowledgement or submission of this document is required with a proposal.

Jessica Ritter: Sitelogiq

- 1. Energy Production Performance Guarantee:** Section III.A requests information regarding energy production guarantees. Is the District seeking a contractually enforceable, project-level energy production guarantee from the prime Contractor that includes ongoing monitoring and a remedy if the system does not achieve the guaranteed level of production? If so, how many of the three required project references should involve an existing operations and maintenance agreement with a California public agency that includes a similar contractor-backed performance guarantee?

SJVAPCD Response: *The RFP does not require a contractually enforceable, project-level energy production guarantee from the prime Contractor with ongoing monitoring and a defined remedy. Proposers shall, however, provide the warranty and energy production guarantee information required by Section III.A, and any production guarantees offered will be considered under the applicable evaluation criteria. The District does not require any of the three project references to include an existing operations and maintenance agreement with a California public agency containing a contractor-backed performance guarantee.*

- 2. NAESCO Accreditation and Demonstrated Performance Capabilities:** Together, the District's Governing Board and staff bring broad public-sector experience in clean energy, infrastructure, policymaking, and long-term capital planning, informed by county and city perspectives from throughout the Valley.

Given that public-agency experience and the rigorous independent review required to earn and maintain NAESCO accreditation, will a prime Proposer that demonstrates all of the following receive additional scoring consideration under the "Experience and Qualifications" and/or "Warranties, Reliability, and Long-Term Support" criteria?

- Current NAESCO accreditation held directly by the prime Proposer;
- Existing long-term operations and maintenance agreements with California public agencies; and
- A demonstrated record of directly providing and standing behind contractor-backed energy production or performance guarantees.

SJVAPCD Response: *The District will review each Proposer's experience, qualifications, relevant accreditations, warranties, reliability, and long-term support capabilities in accordance with the evaluation criteria established in the RFP. These factors will be considered as part of the District's structured evaluation and scoring process; however, no separate or additional scoring preference is guaranteed solely based on NAESCO accreditation or any individual credential.*

3. **Single-Point Accountability:** The Project includes solar PV, parking shade structures, spray polyurethane foam roofing, EV charging retrofits, utility interconnection, commissioning, monitoring, and potential BESS installation.

Please clarify whether the District will give additional evaluation consideration to Proposers that demonstrate the ability to assume single-point contractual responsibility for the design, engineering, procurement, construction, commissioning, interconnection, warranty administration, and long-term support of the integrated Project, regardless of whether qualified subcontractors are used to perform portions of the work.

SJVAPCD Response: *The Project includes solar PV, parking shade structures, spray polyurethane foam roofing, EV charging retrofits, utility interconnection, commissioning, monitoring, and potential BESS installation, which will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria established in the RFP. A Proposer's demonstrated ability to provide coordinated, single-point contractual responsibility for the design, engineering, procurement, construction, commissioning, interconnection, warranty administration, and long-term support of the integrated Project may be considered within the applicable RFP evaluation criteria, regardless of whether qualified subcontractors are used to perform portions of the work.*

4. **Solar PV System Sizing:** Please confirm whether the solar PV system should be sized to provide the most cost-effective solution under the current Net Billing Tariff (NEM 3.0), rather than being required to achieve the 90%–100% annual electricity-consumption offset target referenced in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the RFP.

SJVAPCD Response: *The solar PV system should be sized to provide a cost-effective solution under the applicable Net Billing Tariff while targeting a 90% - 100% annual electricity-consumption offset, as referenced in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the RFP. Proposers should identify the proposed system size, projected annual production and offset, and the basis for their recommended sizing approach.*

Erin Ramos: Re-Gen Electric

1. **As-Built Drawings:** Can you please provide the available as-built drawings for all three District locations: Fresno (Central Region), Modesto (Northern Region), and Bakersfield (Southern Region)?

SJVAPCD Response: *Available as-built drawings for all three locations: Fresno (Central Region), Modesto (Northern Region), and Bakersfield (Southern Region) have been posted to the District website. The drawings are provided for informational purposes only, and Proposers remain responsible for verifying existing site conditions relevant to their proposed work.*

Alex Delgado: GreenEdge Energy

1. Section 2.4(a) establishes a Contractual Placed-in-Service Milestone of November 30, 2027, and separately references December 31, 2027. Please confirm whether November 30, 2027 or December 31, 2027 is the operative date for triggering the damages provision in Section V(c).

SJVAPCD Response: *The November 30, 2027, Contractual Placed-in-Service Milestone is the operative contractual deadline for purposes of the damages provision in Section V(c). The December 31, 2027, date references the applicable federal tax-credit placed-in-service deadline and does not replace or extend the November 30, 2027, contractual milestone.*

2. Section V(c) provides that the District's loss of the Section 6417 elective payment, to the extent caused by the Contractor's unexcused failure to meet the Placed-in-Service Milestone, is a directly

recoverable damage not subject to any cap, exclusion, or limitation on consequential, special, or indirect damages. Would the District consider a negotiated cap or liquidated-damages structure for this specific damages category?

SJVAPCD Response: *The District does not intend to modify the RFP to establish a negotiated cap or liquidated damages structure for this category. The provision is intended to protect the District from the potential loss of federal elective-payment benefits to the extent such loss is directly attributable to the Contractor's unexcused failure to meet the Contractual Placed-in-Service Milestone. The requirements of Section V(c) remain as stated in the RFP.*

3. Under Internal Revenue Code Section 48E as amended by the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, a project is subject to the December 31, 2027 placed-in-service deadline only if construction begins after July 4, 2026. A project (or specific equipment) for which construction is deemed to have begun on or before that date under the applicable IRS beginning-of-construction safe harbor is instead subject to a later placed-in-service deadline (December 31, 2029 or December 31, 2030, depending on the beginning-of-construction date). If a proposer's equipment or scope of work qualifies for one of these later deadlines under IRS rules, would the District consider adjusting the Contractual Placed-in-Service Milestone and the Section V(c) damages provision to align with that later federal deadline?

SJVAPCD Response: *The District has not identified any project-specific activity undertaken on or before July 4, 2026, that would establish beginning of construction for this Project under Section 48E. Accordingly, the District does not intend to modify the Contractual Placed-in-Service Milestone or Section V(c) based on a later federal safe-harbor or placed-in-service date claimed by a proposer. Proposers remain responsible for determining and documenting the federal tax treatment applicable to their proposed approach.*

4. Would the District accept, as part of a proposal, documentation from a subcontractor or equipment supplier establishing that specific equipment to be used on this Project already satisfies the federal beginning-of-construction safe harbor as of a date on or before July 4, 2026, as the basis for the adjustment described in Question 3?

SJVAPCD Response: *A Proposer may submit supporting documentation regarding the proposed project's potential eligibility under applicable federal tax-credit requirements. However, submission or review of such documentation shall not constitute a determination by the District that the Project, or any equipment proposed for use on the Project, satisfies the federal beginning-of-construction requirements or qualifies for a particular federal tax-credit deadline. Proposers remain responsible for establishing and documenting compliance with all applicable federal tax requirements. Submission of such documentation does not entitle a proposer to an adjustment of the Contractual Placed-in-Service Milestone or the Section V(c) provisions.*

Beginning of construction is determined with respect to the taxpayer claiming the credit, which for this Project is the District; equipment previously procured or safe-harbored by a supplier or subcontractor for its own account does not establish beginning of construction for the District's facility.

5. Section 2.2 requires the Proposer to hold all required California contractor licenses; Attachment B separately requires a C-39 (Roofing) classification for the SPF roof scope. May the C-39 classification, and other trade-specific classifications, be held by a licensed, listed subcontractor rather than the Proposer itself?

SJVAPCD Response: *Yes. Trade-specific license classifications, including the C-39 Roofing classification, may be held by a properly licensed subcontractor that will perform the applicable specialty work, provided this arrangement complies with all applicable California contractor licensing requirements. The prime Contractor remains responsible for ensuring that all work is performed by appropriately licensed contractors and subcontractors and for overall compliance with the Contract.*

6. Section IV assumes a 30% federal credit rate reflecting satisfaction of federal prevailing wage and apprenticeship requirements, while Section III directs proposers to keep the system's maximum net output under 1 MW AC. Please confirm whether the District's 30% credit-rate assumption is intended to remain contingent on Contractor satisfaction of federal prevailing wage/apprenticeship given the sub-1MW system size, or whether the District intends for the sub-1 MW exception under IRC Section 48E to apply. (This question does not concern, and does not affect, the Contractor's independent obligation to comply with California state prevailing wage law under Labor Code Section 1720 et seq.)

SJVAPCD Response: *The District confirms that, for purposes of the District's financial assumptions, to the extent the final qualified facility has a maximum net output of less than 1 MW AC and therefore qualifies for the applicable one-megawatt exception under IRC Section 48E, the District's assumption of a 30% federal credit rate is not intended to be contingent upon satisfaction of the federal prevailing wage and apprenticeship requirements. Each proposer remains responsible for determining and substantiating the federal tax treatment applicable to its proposal. This clarification does not modify or affect the Contractor's obligation to comply with all applicable California prevailing wage, apprenticeship, or other state labor requirements.*

This confirmation applies to the solar PV qualified facility only. If the District awards the BESS Additive Alternate or directs a system with a maximum net output of one (1) MW AC or greater, applicable federal prevailing wage and apprenticeship requirements shall be analyzed and, where applicable, satisfied and documented for that property as a condition of the assumed credit rate.

7. Attachment A states the serving utility for the Central Region (Fresno) office as Pacific Gas & Electric but does not state the serving utility for the Northern (Modesto) or Southern (Bakersfield) Region offices. Please confirm the serving utility and applicable rate schedule for both locations.

SJVAPCD Response: *The serving utilities are as follows:*

- *Northern (Modesto) – Modesto Irrigation District*
- *Southern (Bakersfield) – Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E)*

The District is not providing rate schedules for these two facilities because the scope of work at the Modesto and Bakersfield locations is limited to the retrofit of existing EV charging stations and does not include solar generation.

8. Has the District already initiated a Rule 21 pre-application report or feasibility study with the serving utility for the Fresno HQ interconnection? If so, can that be shared with proposers?

SJVAPCD Response: *No. The District has not initiated a Rule 21 pre-application report or feasibility study for the Fresno facility. The selected Contractor will be responsible for preparing and coordinating the required interconnection application, studies, approvals, and related utility requirements as part of the Project.*

9. Attachment A indicates the Bakersfield office already has an existing rooftop solar system. Please confirm whether that system remains in place and whether it has any bearing on the EV charging retrofit scope at that location.

SJVAPCD Response: *The existing rooftop solar system at the Southern Region – Bakersfield facility remains in place. The current RFP does not require replacement or modification of that existing solar system. Proposers shall account for existing site electrical conditions when designing and implementing the EV charging retrofit and shall identify in their proposal any potential conflicts, limitations, or recommended modifications affecting the proposed EV charging work.*

10. Can the District provide existing roof plans or as-built documentation showing rooftop HVAC units, penetrations, and any Authority Having Jurisdiction-required fire-access setbacks at the Fresno building?

SJVAPCD Response: *Available as-built drawings for the Fresno facility have been posted to the District website. The District will post any additional roof plans or related documentation in its possession that may assist proposers, if available. Such documents are for informational purposes only and may not reflect current field conditions. The selected Contractor remains responsible for field verification of all existing conditions and for determining and complying with applicable code, permitting, fire-access, setback, and Authority Having Jurisdiction requirements.*

11. Does the District have an existing roof condition assessment or structural report for the Fresno roof, or is that solely the Contractor's responsibility to commission?

SJVAPCD Response: *The District does not currently have a roof condition assessment or structural report prepared specifically for this Project. The selected Contractor shall be responsible for performing or obtaining any roof, structural, engineering, or other assessments and analyses necessary to design, permit, and construct the proposed improvements.*

12. Can the District provide existing electrical single-line diagrams or panel schedules for the three sites, given that the PV interconnection point is specified as the facility main switchgear?

SJVAPCD Response: *The District will post available electrical single-line diagrams, panel schedules, and/or other electrical documentation in its possession for the three facilities on the District website. Any documents provided are for informational purposes only and may not reflect current field conditions. The selected Contractor shall verify all existing electrical conditions and is responsible for producing any updated drawings, calculations, studies, or documentation necessary to complete the design, permitting, interconnection, and construction of the Project.*

13. What ChargePoint hardware models are currently on the District's account/network being replaced, and is there a required firmware or software version for the new units to integrate cleanly?

SJVAPCD Response: *The District is currently operating the following electric vehicle charging station models:*

Central Region (Fresno): 20 Total EV Ports

- 7 Dual-Port ChargePoint Inc. Level 2 Charging Stations OEM Model (CT4020-HD-GW); 240 V 30 A J1772; Software Version 4.6.0.97
- 4 Single-Port Clipper Creek Level 2 Charging Stations OEM Model (HCS-40R); 208-240 VAC, 50/60 Hz, 120V to GND; SAE J1772 Compliant
- 2 Single-Port Enphase Level 2 Charging Stations OEM Model (HCS-40R); 208-240 VAC, 50/60 Hz, 120V to GND; SAE J1772 Compliant

Northern Region (Modesto): 8 Total EV Ports

- *3 Dual-Port ChargePoint Inc. Level 2 Charging Stations OEM Model (CT4020-HD-GW); 240 V 30 A J1772; Software Version 4.6.0.97*
- *2 Single-Port Clipper Creek Level 2 Charging Stations OEM Model (HCS-40R); 208-240 VAC, 50/60 Hz, 120V to GND; SAE J1772 Compliant*

Southern Region (Bakersfield): 8 Total EV Ports

- *3 Dual-Port ChargePoint Inc. Level 2 Charging Stations OEM Model (CT4020-HD-GW); 240 V 30 A J1772; Software Version 4.6.0.97*
- *2 Single-Port Clipper Creek Level 2 Charging Stations OEM Model (HCS-40R); 208-240 VAC, 50/60 Hz, 120V to GND; SAE J1772 Compliant*

The ten (10) stations to be removed and replaced under this RFP are the single-port Clipper Creek and Enphase units identified above (six at Fresno, two at Modesto, and two at Bakersfield). The dual-port ChargePoint stations are not included in the retrofit scope and will remain in service.

As required by Section II of the RFP, all replacement EVSE shall be ChargePoint brand and shall be networked under the District's existing ChargePoint account, supporting current manufacturer-supported software and firmware at the time of installation. Proposers should identify the specific proposed charging equipment, software/network requirements, licensing or subscription requirements, and any migration or commissioning requirements in their proposal.

- 14.** Does the District want BESS backup/islanding capability priced as a standard inclusion, an exclusion, or a separate alternate?

SJVAPCD Response: *Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) backup and islanding capability is not required as part of the base proposal. If proposed, BESS backup/islanding capability shall be identified and priced as a separate optional alternate, including proposed capacity, functionality, equipment, installation cost, expected useful life, warranty, and any incremental tax-credit or incentive assumptions. The District reserves the right to accept or reject the optional alternate independently of the base solar proposal.*

- 15.** What documentation format does the District expect for the prohibited-foreign-entity/material-assistance certification described in Section 2.2 and Section IV?

SJVAPCD Response: *The District does not require a separate District-prescribed certification form to be submitted with the proposal. The proposer should include a statement confirming that its proposed equipment and supply chain are expected to comply with the prohibited-foreign-entity and material-assistance requirements applicable to the Project and identify the basis for that conclusion. The selected Contractor will be required to provide all supplier certifications, sourcing information, cost documentation, and other records required under applicable federal law and IRS guidance, including Notice 2026-15 and any subsequent applicable guidance, in a form sufficient to support the District's Section 48E credit and Section 6417 elective-payment filing and record-retention requirements.*

This response does not modify the requirement of Section 2.2 and Section III.C that each proposal identify the manufacturer and country of manufacture for all proposed modules, inverters, racking, and battery energy storage equipment, with solar generating property and energy storage property addressed separately.

16. Can the District confirm no bid bond is required with the proposal itself?

SJVAPCD Response: *Confirmed. A bid bond is not required to be submitted with the proposal, unless otherwise expressly provided by an RFP addendum. Any performance bond, payment bond, insurance, or other security requirements applicable to the selected Contractor will be addressed in accordance with the RFP, Contract, and applicable law.*

17. Has the District already determined energy-community adder eligibility for the three sites, or is that left to the proposer?

SJVAPCD Response: *The District has not made a determination regarding energy-community bonus credit eligibility for the Fresno solar facility or any other Project component, and no such adder shall be assumed in the scored analysis without a documented basis, consistent with Section IV. The proposer shall provide the basis and supporting documentation for any claimed energy-community eligibility. The District's acceptance or evaluation of a proposal containing such an assumption shall not constitute a representation, warranty, or determination by the District that the Project qualifies for the federal energy-community bonus credit.*

END OF PROPOSER QUESTIONS AND DISTRICT RESPONSES