



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

January 28, 2025

Answers to Submitted Questions

1. Question:

Should we assume the state of CT will be the off taker for 100% of the kWh produced by these projects?

Answer: Yes.

2. Question:

What is the State's total annual kWh usage?

Answer: This figure is not available. Proposers should assume the State can be the off taker for all production.

3. Question:

Would it be possible to extend the due date by 1 week?

Answer: An extension of the submission deadline is under consideration. We will provide follow-up communication should we extend.

4. Question:

Which projects would have PILOTS (Payment in lieu of taxes) and what value should we assume for that cost?

Answer: Proposers should assume there will be no PILOTS associated with the projects.

5. Question:

Another question regarding Platt Tech: One system (A) is already awarded under NRES Small, while System B was originally designed as a separate Small system with its own meter. However, there may be flexibility to expand System B's capacity under the School Solar category. Can you confirm this for me?

Answer: Confirmed. Platt Tech System A has a small NRES tariff already secured for the project.



System B did not receive a small NRES tariff. For Platt Tech System B, Proposers are not limited to the rooftop area indicated in the conceptual design and are allowed to propose a larger size as long as the configuration is permissible for an add-on system according to the NRES program rules.

6. Question:

Please confirm if Rentschler Field's system will be situated on a single or multiple parcels. Also, does Rentschler Field have more than one meter to connect behind?

Answer: The bulk of the conceptual layout is included on parcel ID: 16785 and extends to parcels 51333 and 50081. Confirmed, Rentschler has more than one meter. Please see the information provided in Exhibit A.

7. Question:

Are we required to bid for the entire portfolio?

Answer: No, it is not required to bid the entire portfolio.

8. Question:

Do the Morgan and Buckingham St carports need to be long span, or can we customize the site to make it more feasible/cost-effective?

Answer: We welcome any design changes to make the project more cost effective. Please note the changes in your response.

9. Question:

The contracting and development steps highlighted on page 3 mention that the School Solar projects have us applying and securing the incentive ourselves. Can you confirm that to be the case?

Answer: Confirmed.

10. Question:

The RFP requests a 10 MW carport system at Rentschler Field but based on the facility's electric load and the provided bill, only approximately 3 MW of solar appears necessary to meet 100% of the site's annual consumption. Could you clarify whether the intent is to allocate excess generation to other accounts within the SAM customer's portfolio, or if the requested system size is driven by other considerations (e.g., maximizing site potential or interconnection capacity)?

Answer: Yes, Rentschler Field is a SAM customer and able to virtually net meter the proposed system size to other beneficial accounts.



11. Question:

If projects are designed to exceed the load requirements of the primary site, will the Connecticut Green Bank facilitate arrangements for the allocation or sale of excess generation to other eligible accounts, or is this the responsibility of the bidder or the SAM customer

Answer: Yes, the Green Bank will facilitate the identification of eligible beneficial accounts for projects that virtually net meter and coordinate PPAs for the sale of all electricity.

12. Question:

Section 4 of the NRES Program Manual specifies that NRES co-located projects are limited to 5 MW unless separately metered. Does Rentschler Field have an additional meter that could be used to connect a second 5 MW system, or would we need to qualify for an exception to the NRES rules to install a second 5 MWac system at the same time?

Answer: Confirmed, Rentschler has more than one meter. Please see the information provided in Exhibit A, specifically Drawing E201C that shows the Main Electrical room, and the CL+P Meters are identified and photo 2023-02-16 13-13-25.

13. Question:

We are assuming several of these projects will be structured as Front of the meter projects (specifically Rentschler and Waterford). Can CTGB confirm that is accurate?

Answer: Confirmed, Waterford will be a front of the meter project since there is no onsite load. For the remaining sites, Green Bank defers to Proposers to model a project that has a reasonable pathway to development success and that maximizes the project value to the site owner. We have uploaded interval data for accounts (where available) and utility bill data. If it makes sense to develop a project behind the meter, we welcome recommendations from Proposers.

14. Question:

The system production will far exceed the annual KWH consumption for the larger sites. We are assuming CTGB will be able to identify and coordinate with SAM (State, Agricultural, Municipal) accounts that will act as beneficial accounts/off-takers for the projects. Is that correct?

Answer: Yes, the Green Bank will facilitate the identification of eligible beneficial accounts for projects that virtually net meter and will coordinate PPAs for the sale of all electricity."

15. Question:

Will CTGB consider proposals that contain a fixed escalator (i.e. a 1 or 2% escalator for the 20–25-year period)? Or will CTGB only consider fixed 0% escalator offers?

Answer: A fixed 0% PPA rate is required in the submission and is preferred. However, Proposers can submit proposals with a 1% and/or 2% escalator.



16. Question:

Rentschler question– is there a reason the design included with the RFP didn't place carports to the northeast of the Stadium? Is it OK to use that space or do we need to avoid it?

Answer: Yes, please only design in the areas identified in the conceptual layout provided. Other open areas have been excluded per the site owners' request.

17. Question:

Several of the sites are eligible for the energy community and LMI ITC adders (10% each) on top of the typical 30% ITC. The new Trump administration is causing uncertainty for the future of the adders. Does CTGB want us to propose PPA prices assuming the additional adders are included? Or should we just assume the base 30% for now?

Answer: Green Bank does not have certainty on which adders may be secured for each project and defers to Proposers on their ITC strategy. Please submit pricing that assumes the ITC level based on your company's risk tolerance and please indicate the ITC level assumed.