

**STATE OF ALASKA RFI NUMBER 2525H032
AMENDMENT NUMBER ONE (1)**

AMENDMENT ISSUING OFFICE:



Department of Transportation & Public Facilities
Statewide Contracting & Procurement
P.O. Box 112500
(3132 Channel Drive, Room 350)
Juneau, Alaska 99811-2500

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER

DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: October 28, 2024

RFI #2525H032 ALASKA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT SYSTEM PHOTOVOLTAIC (PV) ARRAY

DUE DATE: November 12, 2024 at 4:00 PM. (Alaska Time)

The purpose of this Amendment #1 is to:

- **Answer questions received**
- **Revise the due date and time for responses to be received**

Questions and Answers

Question #1.

Is the intent of the RFI to solicit proposals from Consulting Engineers to create a manufacturer agnostic RFP, and then Vendors/Installers/Contractors respond to that RFP, or is the intent of the RFI to solicit proposals from the Vendors/Installers/Contractors? The reason I ask is there is language in the Introduction which makes it clear that the deliverable is an RFP (and there are tasks in the RFI that a Consulting Engineer would perform) but there are also deliverables that a Contractor would normally develop in the Submission Information section. This is also supported by the fact that the RFI states to assume construction is expected to begin in 2025, which means you need to get a Contractor onboarded sooner rather than later to start procurement of long lead items. Alternatively this RFI could be asking for a Design-Build team, but the fact that the deliverable is an RFP doesn't support that.

(Company) is interested in performing this work and responding to the RFI, but I want to be sure that out services is what your team is looking for.

I also have a question regarding "PV Array Size" under assumptions. It notes to assume a 10kw PV array size. Is this a typo (should be 10 MW) or does it mean to model 1000 of 10kw PV arrays (to obtain 10MW of power) at each location?

Answer #1.

Thank you for your request for clarification. Our goal with this RFI is not to specifically target consulting engineers, but rather to explore the best path forward for installations. We are seeking to understand the full range of services that proposers can offer to help us select the most advantageous procurement vehicle to proceed. We aim to have construction underway by summer 2025, and we recognize that certain long-lead items may impact this timeline. Therefore, we welcome suggestions on sequencing or phasing of installations that could create value by allowing the project to proceed in stages. If a contracting vendor

does not have in-house capacity for certain aspects, we ask that they respond as thoroughly as possible, focusing on their core strengths as a contractor. Similarly, if a consulting engineer lacks installation capabilities, we encourage them to complete the responses, emphasizing their relevant expertise.

Depending on the responses, if there is a clear trend or recommendation to issue two separate RFPs—one for professional services and another for installation services—that is an option we will consider. Our main objective is to develop a comprehensive and effective strategy for successful project execution, and your input is vital in shaping that plan.

This is for a 10 MW system. The reference to 10 kW was a typo, and the intended array size is 10 MW; specific power ratings per panel were not provided.

Question #2.

I have a question regarding RFI #2525H032 Alaska International Airport System Photovoltaic Array Installation Project. On page 3 of the RFI, Specifications states to “provide information for a 10 MW PV system at TSAIA and FIA”. However, on page 4, Potential Assumptions states that “Responses are recommended to include...10 kW PV array for modeling purposes”. Would you clarify if the system that should be modeled in our response for 10 MW or 10 kW?

Answer #2.

This is for a 10 MW system. The reference to 10 kW was a typo.

Question #3.

Would the DOT&PF consider offering all bidders a two-week extension to the November 1st due date?

Answer #3.

The due date for responses to be received by the State has been extended to November 12, 2024 at 4:00 PM. (Alaska Time)

Question #4.

- a. Do you have any specific preference on location for the proposed solar arrays on these sites?
- b. Additionally, the RFI calls for a proposed 10MW DC system at each site location. Are we to assume 10MW DC at each site? Or, is this a collective 10MW broken up between the two?
- c. Lastly, on page 4 under Potential Assumptions, the PV Array Size states " assume a 10kW PV array for modeling purposes". Can you clarify what you're looking for here?

Answer #4.

- a. At this time, we are open to suggestions. Several non-aeronautical lots at TSAIA have been identified as candidate locations, but we are open to additional recommendations based on considerations such as orientation to sunlight, cost for ancillary equipment needed at various locations, and public interest or concern. Mention of other considerations for site selection are appreciated.
- b. We are proposing a 10 MW DC system at each airport. One system will be at TSAIA and another will be at Fairbanks International Airport.
- c. To ensure consistent comparison across proposals for the Benefit-Cost Ratio and other attributes, we request that proposers submit concepts and recommendations for the same array size of 10 MW. The reference to 10 kW is a typo. If another size is evaluated or recommended, please note the reasoning for future consideration.

Question #5.

I don't know if it is too late, or even necessary to make changes to the recently published solar RFI this late in the process, but it was brought to my attention that there are a couple of minor corrections that could be made. Essentially, the assumed PV array size of 10kW should be 10MW, and the peak consumption (total power used) is different than peak demand (maximum rate at which electricity is being consumed).

My assumption is that solar firms that might respond to this RFI are going to be able to figure out what was intended, but all the same I thought I would forward this to you and let you know

Answer #5.

Thank you for bringing this to our attention. The assumed PV array size should indeed be 10 MW, not 10 kW. We appreciate your attention to detail, and we believe that solar firms responding to the RFI will be able to interpret the intended requirements accordingly.

End of Questions and Answers

Modifications to the RFI

Modification #1

The Due Date and time for bids to be received is revised to:

November 12, 2024 at 4:00 PM. Alaska Time

End of modifications to the RFI

Signature:  Date: 10-28-24

Name: Chris Hunt
Title: Procurement Specialist 5