



North Hunterdon-Voorhees Regional High School District

“Providing Success For All Students”

1445 State Route 31, Annandale, NJ 08801
Tel: 908-735-2846 FAX: 908-735-6914

JEFFREY BENDER
Superintendent of Schools

RICHARD A. BERGACS, Ed.D.
Assistant Superintendent of Schools

KATHRYN BLEW, CPA
*Acting School Business Administrator/
Secretary, Board of Education*

April 17, 2020

To Whom It May Concern:

Under the Energy Savings Improvement Program (“ESIP”), the District issued an RFP (Request for Proposals) to solicit qualified companies to compete for a Solar Energy Power Purchase Agreement (RFP Number 2020-01) to generate solar electricity from solar energy systems to be located at the North Hunterdon and Voorhees High School locations.

An Evaluation Committee (“the Committee”) is comprised of the School Business Administrator and the Assistant Superintendent. The Committee’s role was to fairly evaluate the proposals and to ensure that each proposal met the goals of the District’s plan. The Committee also utilized an evaluation report prepared by the District’s ESIP partner, Honeywell Building Solutions (“Honeywell”) to determine which proposal best fulfilled the RFP objectives. Honeywell’s report is attached.

The RFP contained three (3) bidding options: Roofs and Canopies, Roof Only, or Canopy Only. The Committee came to a consensus to decide on the Roof Only option. The Roof Only option was chosen due to the highest savings and lowest cost, with the least disruption to the school facility site.

Seven companies responded with proposals that were received and opened on Wednesday, February 26, 2020. Proposals were received from the following companies: Advance Solar Products (ASP), BrightCore, Constellation NewEnergy, Inc., Ferreira, HESP Solar, Marina and Solar Landscape. Marina’s proposal was determined to be flawed and/or deficient, which removed this company from advancing in the evaluation process.

The Committee requested that the proposers extend their proposed pricing longer than the typical 60 days in order to allow the Committee additional time to review their proposals, and to review the findings prior to award. Ferreira, Marina and Solar Landscape did not extend the pricing past the 60 days, while the remaining four companies consented to the extension.

The Committee scored proposals on a pre-established set of criteria. Based on the excellent savings and pricing offered by ASP, and the highly evaluated technical proposal, proposed equipment and their superior experience in delivering Solar PPA services, the Evaluation Committee held an interview with the team from ASP via teleconference. The Committee posed questions and sought clarification concerning various aspects of the proposal. The interview provided confirmation to the Committee in its assessment of the proposals and their recommendation of ASP as the awardee.

Based on the criteria for selection as established in the issued RFP document, the Committee determined that Advanced Solar Products (ASP) will best meet the RFP requirements. Therefore, the Committee recommends that the Board approve awarding the contract for the Solar Energy Power Purchase Agreement to ASP and for Board staff and ESIP consultants proceed with the implementation of the contract.

Enclosed: Bid Evaluation Analysis

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
FOR A SOLAR ENERGY POWER PURCHASE AGREEMENT TO PROVIDE SOLAR GENERATED ELECTRICITY
FOR NHVRHSD**

**BID EVALUATION ANALYSIS
Confidential**

April 7, 2020

Prepared by:

**Honeywell Building Solutions
Energy Services Group**

Summary of Proposals

In accordance with The BOE approval; a request for proposals (RFP) was issued by The BOE seeking bids from qualified energy services firms to provide a power purchase agreement service to generate solar electricity for the entire site including roof and ground mounted options. The base bid includes the roof and 3 arrays on the ground and the add/Alternate is ground mounted array 4 as an addition to the project.

There were 7 bids (proposals) submitted prior to the due date and time:

Solar Capacity Comparison by Proposer and Design Options

	BASE BID	OPTION 1	OPTION 2
Proposers	Roofs & Canopy KW dc	Canopy ONLY KW dc	Roof ONLY KW dc
ASP	3,138.08	2,055.48	1,834.66
BRIGHTCORE	3,146.57	1,734.84	1,411.73
CONSTELLATION	2,732.80	1,550.40	1,182.40
FERREIRA	3,150.40	1,749.60	1,400.80
HESP	3,048.82	N/A	1,796.80
MARINA	N/A	N/A	N/A
SOLAR LANDSCAPE	1,130.00	N/A	1,766.00

In evaluating the bids, the goals and objectives of the BOE were carefully considered. The criteria established in the RFP are:

- Price per solar kWh, as well as total long-term savings (35%);
- Quality of the proposed equipment and the technical design (40%);
- Qualifications and experience of the vendor (vendor teams) (25%).

Each of these bidders had a good pricing structure, good proposed design and good projected 15-year savings. Also, their experience with solar construction is acceptable; and they have good experience in providing solar energy systems; including New Jersey public works projects specifically.

However, due to the number of bidders and the resulting evaluation of the proposals, Marina is not competitive with their pricing and also did not provide a notarized bid bond with their proposal as required. Constellation included a list of assumptions and terms that exclude compliance with both equipment minimum requirements, construction requirements and obligation to assume a base cost for interconnection costs in such a way that their proposal becomes deficient as compared to the minimum requirements of the RFP (*see page 27 of their proposal*). In addition, Brightcore has inserted their form of PPA agreement into the proposal. Due to the competitive nature of their pricing and savings they have been summarized in this report, however. It must be made clear that the form of PPA contract that they included in their bid cannot be used; and the form of PPA contract included in the RFP shall be the contractual agreement for the awarded bidder.

Solar kWh Pricing and Total Saving Comparison

The Price/Savings is 35% of the evaluation criteria; as such, 35 points out of 100 are assigned to the evaluation of this aspect of the recommended proposals. (17.5 for \$/KWh and 17.5 for highest 15-year savings.)

Point comparison based on the proportional differential percentage in comparison to highest ranking bidder.

15 Year Savings Comparison

Proposers	ASP	BRIGHTCORE	CONSTELLATION	FERREIRA	HESP	MARINA	SOLAR LANDSCAPE
BASE BID	\$3,465,582	\$3,248,545	\$2,925,204	\$2,884,464	\$2,352,664	N/A	\$3,018,762
OPTION 1 CANOPY	-\$157,274	\$634,960	\$1,298,821	\$303,431	N/A	N/A	N/A
OPTION 2 ROOFS	\$3,001,288	\$2,046,074	\$1,630,856	\$2,030,029	\$1,793,123	N/A	\$2,412,582
Ranking BASE BID	1	2	4	5	6		3
Points	17.5	16.4	14.8	14.6	11.9	N/A	15.2

Comparison of Pricing based on the KWh price for the Base Bid. While the savings are the highest for the base bid design proposals; the pricing is much better on a KWh basis for the Roof Only option see below.

BASE BID (ROOF AND CANOPY OPTIMIZED SAVINGS)

Proposers	ASP	BRIGHTCORE	CONSTELLATION	FERREIRA	HESP	MARINA	SOLAR LANDSCAPE
Year 1	\$0.0490	\$0.0395	\$0.0470	\$0.0470	\$0.0550	N/A	\$0.0467
Year 2	\$0.0499	\$0.0404	\$0.0470	\$0.0477	\$0.0558		\$0.0473
Year 3	\$0.0507	\$0.0413	\$0.0470	\$0.0484	\$0.0567		\$0.0479
Year 4	\$0.0516	\$0.0422	\$0.0470	\$0.0491	\$0.0575		\$0.0485
Year 5	\$0.0525	\$0.0431	\$0.0470	\$0.0499	\$0.0584		\$0.0491
Year 6	\$0.0534	\$0.0440	\$0.0470	\$0.0506	\$0.0593		\$0.0497
Year 7	\$0.0544	\$0.0450	\$0.0470	\$0.0514	\$0.0601		\$0.0503
Year 8	\$0.0553	\$0.0460	\$0.0470	\$0.0522	\$0.0610		\$0.0509
Year 9	\$0.0563	\$0.0470	\$0.0470	\$0.0529	\$0.0620		\$0.0516
Year 10	\$0.0573	\$0.0480	\$0.0470	\$0.0537	\$0.0629		\$0.0522
Year 11	\$0.0583	\$0.0491	\$0.0470	\$0.0545	\$0.0639		\$0.0529
Year 12	\$0.0593	\$0.0502	\$0.0470	\$0.0554	\$0.0649		\$0.0535
Year 13	\$0.0603	\$0.0513	\$0.0470	\$0.0562	\$0.0658		\$0.0542
Year 14	\$0.0614	\$0.0524	\$0.0470	\$0.0570	\$0.0667		\$0.0549
Year 15	\$0.0625	\$0.0536	\$0.0470	\$0.0579	\$0.0677		\$0.0556
Average Price	\$0.0555	\$0.0462	\$0.0470	\$0.0523	\$0.0612		\$0.0510
Ranking	5	1	2	4	6	N/A	3
Points	14.6	17.5	17.2	15.5	13.2		15.9

Comparison of Pricing based on the KWh price for the Option 1 Canopy ONLY. Due to the much better pricing and savings for the Base bid and Option 2, it is not recommended that the canopy only alternate be selected unless the district does not want to use the roofs for the solar installation.

OPTION 1 CANOPY ONLY							
Proposers	ASP	BRIGHTCORE	CONSTELLATION	FERREIRA	HESP	MARINA	SOLAR LANDSCAPE
Year 1	\$0.1000	\$0.0740	\$0.0600	\$0.0880	N/A	N/A	N/A
Year 2	\$0.1018	\$0.0756	\$0.0600	\$0.0893			
Year 3	\$0.1035	\$0.0773	\$0.0600	\$0.0907			
Year 4	\$0.1053	\$0.0790	\$0.0600	\$0.0920			
Year 5	\$0.1072	\$0.0807	\$0.0600	\$0.0934			
Year 6	\$0.1091	\$0.0825	\$0.0600	\$0.0948			
Year 7	\$0.1110	\$0.0843	\$0.0600	\$0.0962			
Year 8	\$0.1129	\$0.0862	\$0.0600	\$0.0977			
Year 9	\$0.1149	\$0.0881	\$0.0600	\$0.0991			
Year 10	\$0.1169	\$0.0900	\$0.0600	\$0.1006			
Year 11	\$0.1189	\$0.0920	\$0.0600	\$0.1021			
Year 12	\$0.1210	\$0.0940	\$0.0600	\$0.1037			
Year 13	\$0.1231	\$0.0961	\$0.0600	\$0.1052			
Year 14	\$0.1253	\$0.0982	\$0.0600	\$0.1068			
Year 15	\$0.1275	\$0.1004	\$0.0600	\$0.1084			
Average Price	\$0.1132	\$0.0866	\$0.0600	\$0.0979			
Ranking	4	2	1	3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Points	9.3	12.1	17.5	10.7			

Comparison of Pricing based on the KWh price for Option 2 – Roofs ONLY. While the savings are the highest for the base bid design proposals; the price per KWh for the roof only option is very low and the savings are almost as much from certain proposers. The Evaluation Committee should consider carefully between the Base bid best which has the highest overall savings and the Option 2 which has the best pricing and very high savings in comparison to the Base Bid.

OPTION 2 ROOFS ONLY							
Proposers	ASP	BRIGHTCORE	CONSTELLATION	FERREIRA	HESP	MARINA	SOLAR LANDSCAPE
Year 1	\$0.0090	\$0.0180	\$0.0300	\$0.0180	\$0.0420	N/A	\$0.0250
Year 2	\$0.0092	\$0.0184	\$0.0300	\$0.0183	\$0.0426		\$0.0253
Year 3	\$0.0093	\$0.0188	\$0.0300	\$0.0185	\$0.0432		\$0.0256
Year 4	\$0.0095	\$0.0192	\$0.0300	\$0.0188	\$0.0439		\$0.0259
Year 5	\$0.0096	\$0.0196	\$0.0300	\$0.0191	\$0.0445		\$0.0263
Year 6	\$0.0098	\$0.0200	\$0.0300	\$0.0194	\$0.0452		\$0.0266
Year 7	\$0.0100	\$0.0204	\$0.0300	\$0.0197	\$0.0459		\$0.0269
Year 8	\$0.0102	\$0.0208	\$0.0300	\$0.0200	\$0.0466		\$0.0273
Year 9	\$0.0103	\$0.0213	\$0.0300	\$0.0203	\$0.0473		\$0.0276
Year 10	\$0.0105	\$0.0218	\$0.0300	\$0.0206	\$0.0480		\$0.0280
Year 11	\$0.0107	\$0.0223	\$0.0300	\$0.0209	\$0.0487		\$0.0283
Year 12	\$0.0109	\$0.0228	\$0.0300	\$0.0212	\$0.0494		\$0.0287
Year 13	\$0.0111	\$0.0233	\$0.0300	\$0.0215	\$0.0502		\$0.0290
Year 14	\$0.0113	\$0.0238	\$0.0300	\$0.0218	\$0.0509		\$0.0294
Year 15	\$0.0115	\$0.0243	\$0.0300	\$0.0222	\$0.0517		\$0.0297
Average Price	\$0.0102	\$0.0210	\$0.0300	\$0.0200	\$0.0467		\$0.0273
Ranking	1	3	5	2	6	N/A	4
Points	17.5	8.5	5.9	8.9	3.8		6.5

Conclusions and Recommendations

Each of these bids would provide viable solutions and substantial savings to the BOE. However, based on all of the evaluation criteria the bids submitted by ASP and Brightcore score highest in both savings/price, as well as have excellent equipment and design as well as good experience.

In the next section, there are more detailed summaries of the 5 bidders' proposals that detail the price, saving, technical design, proposed equipment and provided documentation of the bidder's qualifications and experience in delivering PPA services. Honeywell does not recommend that the evaluation committee consider either Marina or Constellation proposals for award due to the aforementioned issues with their submissions.

The Evaluation Committee should make a decision based on the proposals; whether or not to award the Base Bid or Option 2 Roofs-ONLY in determining the best option for the district.

Advanced Solar Products (ASP) Technical Proposal Evaluation				
Proposal Option	Solar Panel Type	Warranty	Description	Additional Comments
Base Bid	Helios 420 W panels	25 year warranty on linear power and 10 product warranty	96 cell mono-crystalline module with rated efficiency at 16.3%.	High efficiency panels. Product warranty complies with RFP requirements. Made in USA
OPTION 1 Canopy	" "	" "	" "	" "
OPTION 2 Roofs	" "	" "	" "	" "
	Inverter Type	Warranty	Description	Additional Comments
Base Bid	Solaredge	15 year option for up to 20 years	98.5% efficiency rating.	Complies with RFP requirements.
OPTION 1 Canopy	" "	" "	" "	" "
OPTION 2 Roofs	" "	" "	" "	" "
Base Bid	Panelclaw Polar Bear for Roofs and RBI Truss system for the canopy	25 years	ZAM coating for roof and Galvanized for canopy	Complies with RFP requirements.
OPTION 1 Canopy	" "	" "	" "	" "
OPTION 2 Roofs	" "	" "	" "	" "
	Design Capacity (KW dc)	Tilt/Azimuth	Additional Comments	
Base Bid	3,138.08	7 degrees tilt 195 canopy and 5 degrees tilt 172 azimuth roof	High capacity layout and design.	
OPTION 1 Canopy	2,055.48	" "	" "	
OPTION 2 Roofs	1,834.66	" "	" "	
	15 Year Average Price		15 Year Savings	Additional Comments
Base Bid	\$0.0555		\$3,465,582	
OPTION 1 Canopy	\$0.1132			
OPTION 2	\$0.0102		-\$157,274	
			\$3,001,288	
<p>NOTES: This team has the most experience especially with New Jersey School District solar energy projects. The design includes high efficiency equipment that complies or exceeds the specifications in the RFP. Their proposal is the best price in savings if option 2 is selected and the highest savings and 2nd best price on the base bid.</p>				

Brightcore Technical Proposal Evaluation				
Proposal Option	Solar Panel Type	Warranty	Description	Additional Comments
Base Bid	Canadian Solar 395 -410 W	25 year warranty on linear power and 10 product warranty	72 cell mono-crystalline module with rated efficiency at 19.16%.	High efficiency panels. Product warranty complies with RFP requirements.
OPTION 1 Canopy	" "	" "	" "	" "
OPTION 2 Roofs	" "	" "	" "	" "
	Inverter Type	Warranty	Description	Additional Comments
Base Bid	Solaredge	15 year option for up to 20 years	98.5% efficiency rating.	Complies with RFP requirements.
OPTION 1 Canopy	" "	" "	" "	" "
OPTION 2 Roofs	" "	" "	" "	" "
Base Bid	Panelclaw Polar Bear for Roofs and not specified for Canopy.	25 years	ZAM coating for roof	Complies with RFP requirements for roofs. No specified canopy mounting system.
OPTION 1 Canopy	" "	" "	" "	" "
OPTION 2 Roofs	" "	" "	" "	" "
	Design Capacity (KW dc)	Tilt/Azimuth	Additional Comments	
Base Bid	3,146.57	5 and 2 degree tilts and various azimuth depending on installation, good layout	High capacity layout and design.	
OPTION 1 Canopy	1,734.84	" "	" "	
OPTION 2 Roofs	1,411.73	" "	" "	
	15 Year Average Price		15 Year Savings	Additional Comments
Base Bid	\$0.0462		\$3,248,545	
OPTION 1 Canopy	\$0.0866		\$634,960	
OPTION 2	\$0.0210		\$2,046,074	
<p>NOTES: This team has included a PPA contract agreement into their bid. It must be made clear to them that the Exhibit C PPA agreement approved by the Districts attorney is the contract and no substantial changes can be made in accordance with Public Bid Law in New Jersey. Brightcore did not submit the required forms such as Business Registration etc. for their company. They did provide these documents for subcontractors, however they as the lead should provide the valid required forms as is required by the RFP and bid law.</p>				

Ferriera Technical Proposal Evaluation				
Proposal Option	Solar Panel Type	Warranty	Description	Additional Comments
Base Bid	HT-SAAE 400 W panels	25 year warranty on linear power and 10 product warranty	96 cell mono-crystalline module with rated efficiency at 16.3%.	High efficiency panels. Product warranty complies with RFP requirements. Made in USA
OPTION 1 Canopy	" "	" "	" "	" "
OPTION 2 Roofs	" "	" "	" "	" "
	Inverter Type	Warranty	Description	Additional Comments
Base Bid	Chint Power Systems and Solaredge	15 year option for up to 20 years	98.5% efficiency rating.	Complies with RFP requirements.
OPTION 1 Canopy	" "	" "	" "	" "
OPTION 2 Roofs	" "	" "	" "	" "
Base Bid	None specified			Must meet the RFP requirements and should be verified prior to award.
OPTION 1 Canopy	" "	" "	" "	" "
OPTION 2 Roofs	" "	" "	" "	" "
	Design Capacity (KW dc)	Tilt/Azimuth	Additional Comments	
Base Bid	3,146.57	5 degrees for roofs and 2 degrees for canopy. Various.	High capacity layout and design.	
OPTION 1 Canopy	1,734.84	" "	" "	
OPTION 2 Roofs	1,411.73	" "	" "	
	15 Year Average Price		15 Year Savings	Additional Comments
Base Bid	\$0.0523		\$2,884,464	
OPTION 1 Canopy	\$0.0979		\$303,431	
OPTION 2	\$0.0200		\$2,030,029	
NOTES: While they have excellent pricing and savings for the Base Bid, the Option 2 pricing is more than double the lowest proposed PPA rate. The mounting system specifications needs to be provided prior to award if they are to be selected.				

HESP Technical Proposal Evaluation				
Proposal Option	Solar Panel Type	Warranty	Description	Additional Comments
Base Bid	Canadian Solar Tallmax 395 W panels	25 year warranty on linear power and 10 product warranty	144 cell mono-crystalline module with rated efficiency at 19.9%.	High efficiency panels. Product warranty complies with RFP requirements.
OPTION 1 Canopy	" "	" "	" "	" "
OPTION 2 Roofs	" "	" "	" "	" "
	Inverter Type	Warranty	Description	Additional Comments
Base Bid	Yaskawa/Solec tria	15 year option for up to 20 years	98.5% efficiency rating.	Complies with RFP requirements.
OPTION 1 Canopy	" "	" "	" "	" "
OPTION 2 Roofs	" "	" "	" "	" "
Base Bid	Solar Mounts Atlantis for roofs and Galatic for canopy	25	Aluminum for roofs and hot dipped galvanized for canopy.	Complies with RFP requirements.
OPTION 1 Canopy	" "	" "	" "	" "
OPTION 2 Roofs	" "	" "	" "	" "
	Design Capacity (KW dc)	Tilt/Azimuth	Additional Comments	
Base Bid	3,048.82	7 degrees for roofs and canopy. Various.	good capacity layout and design.	
OPTION 1 Canopy	N/A	" "	" "	
OPTION 2 Roofs	1,790.80	" "	" "	
	15 Year Average Price		15 Year Savings	Additional Comments
Base Bid	\$0.0612		\$2,352,664	
OPTION 1 Canopy	N/A		N/A	
OPTION 2	\$0.0467		\$1,793,123	

NOTES: Good technical proposal, good experience with solar projects in NJ and specifically with public works projects.

Solar Landscape Technical Proposal Evaluation				
Proposal Option	Solar Panel Type	Warranty	Description	Additional Comments
Base Bid	GCL 405 W panels	25 year warranty on linear power and 10 product warranty	144 cell mono-crystalline module with rated efficiency at 20.1%.	VERY High efficiency panels. Product warranty complies with RFP requirements.
OPTION 1 Canopy	" "	" "	" "	" "
OPTION 2 Roofs	" "	" "	" "	" "
	Inverter Type	Warranty	Description	Additional Comments
Base Bid	Solaredge and Chint	15 year option for up to 20 years	98.5% efficiency rating.	Complies with RFP requirements.
OPTION 1 Canopy	" "	" "	" "	" "
OPTION 2 Roofs	" "	" "	" "	" "
Base Bid	Panelclaw Claw FR for Roofs and RBI Tee-shaped system for the canopy	25 years	ZAM coating for roof and Galvnized for canopy	Complies with RFP requirements.
OPTION 1 Canopy	" "	" "	" "	" "
OPTION 2 Roofs	" "	" "	" "	" "
	Design Capacity (KW dc)	Tilt/Azimuth	Additional Comments	
Base Bid	1,130.00	5 to 10 degrees tilt various azimuth depending on site conditions.	Good capacity layout and design.	
OPTION 1 Canopy	N/A	" "	" "	
OPTION 2 Roofs	1,766.00	" "	" "	
	15 Year Average Price		15 Year Savings	Additional Comments
Base Bid	\$0.0510		\$3,018,762	
OPTION 1 Canopy	N/A		N/A	
OPTION 2 Roofs	\$0.0273		\$2,412,582	
NOTES: This team has good experience with New Jersey Public works projects. The design includes high efficiency equipment that complies or exceeds the specifications in the RFP.				