

Date of Issue: January 10, 2019

DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES  
ENERGY AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT OFFICE  
401 NORTH STREET HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

BULLETIN NO. 7  
on

Project No. GESA 2018-2 – REQUEST FOR QUOTES FOR A GUARANTEED ENERGY SAVINGS PROJECT AT: DEPT. OF CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES, STATE PARKS, CENTRAL REGION, PENNSYLVANIA Department of General Services, Energy & Resource Management, 401 North Street, Room 403, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 17120.

**QUOTE SUBMISSION DEADLINE: THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 2019**  
**TIME OF OPENING: 2:00 PM**

**QUESTIONS / RFI**

1. Please confirm that there is no DGS Energy Consultant for this project, and that ESCOs should not include any related Energy Consultant service fees (4-7%) within project financials or overall economics. **Confirmed.**
2. The response to Bulletin No. 6, question 5 indicated that the limit of Capital Cost Avoidance savings that ESCOs can include in the project cash flow & pro forma is \$300,000 per building, per ECM and it must be energy related. With 8 state parks with multiple buildings per park and at least 7 core ECM's per park the proposed value of Capital Cost Avoidance savings could increase quickly. As was indicated in Bulletin 8 of the SCI Houtzdale GESA RFQ, should we also expect that unrealistic capital savings values included in the proposals will be identified and will negatively impact the proposal's score? **Yes, that is correct. To further clarify, these savings are considered "Energy Related Cost Savings" and not "Capital Cost Savings".**
3. In certain instances, it is difficult to match the electrical data provided with the building in each park. For example, the data provided for Bald Eagle and Black Moshannon does not provide the service location for each account. *Could we be provided a key that indicates the building service location for each of the account numbers for these parks?* It may be that this information was accidentally omitted when the summary spreadsheet was prepared. **The information that was compiled for the DGS EnergyCAP team via EDI in July 2018 can be found on the 2018-2 DCNR Central project page of the DGS Energy & Resource Management's website. Note that Parker Dam is not included, so its bills must be from a co-op which are paid directly via the Budget Office's utility billing P.O. Box. The direct link is:**  
<https://www.dgs.pa.gov/State%20Government/Facilities%20and%20Space%20Management/Energy-Savings-Program/Pages/2018-2-DCNR-Central-Region.aspx>

4. Can DCNR provide the square footage for the park offices and maintenance buildings? Since the parks are often in wooded locations, satellite views are not as useful as they would normally be to estimate this information. We use this information to ensure realistic energy savings calculations and confirm sizing of the HVAC equipment. **Additional building information can be found under “Bulletin 7 Documents” on the 2018-2 DCNR Central project page of the DGS Energy & Resource Management’s website. The direct link is: <https://www.dgs.pa.gov/State%20Government/Facilities%20and%20Space%20Management/Energy-Savings-Program/Pages/2018-2-DCNR-Central-Region.aspx>**
5. Some of the parks have undergone recent renovations to systems. How are the net present value of those systems to be treated? Replacement of the systems may result in a cost savings through a fuel-switch, but have not reached their useful life, and are in good operable condition. Should ESCOs consider new system replacements on these recently renovated systems? **ESCOs should determine what ECMs to include in their quotations and make note of any concerns. Inclusion/exclusion will be discussed in the IGA phase with the selected ESCO. The ultimate decision will be in the hands of Forestry, Parks and DCNR Executives.**
6. Some of the parks are proactively replacing Domestic Hot Water (DHW) units in bath houses with varying technologies. Is it DCNR’s goal to arrive at a larger-scale, uniform, DHW solution for all parks in the region, or a uniform solution by park, or is solution based solely on energy or cost savings? **ESCOs should determine what ECMs to include in their quotations and make note of any concerns. Inclusion/exclusion will be discussed in the IGA phase with the selected ESCO. The ultimate decision will be in the hands of Forestry, Parks and DCNR Executives.**
7. Some parks are already in process of updating their sewage treatment processes. Others have unique situations, such as boroughs or townships, that pay portions of the billing or collaboratively share resources. Is the goal of Core ECM #6 to create a uniform solution for all parks or is it to be customized to each park? If the parks are already planning upgrades, should they be excluded from the measure? **ESCOs should determine what ECMs to include in their quotations and make note of any concerns. Inclusion/exclusion will be discussed in the IGA phase with the selected ESCO. The ultimate decision will be in the hands of Forestry, Parks and DCNR Executives.**
8. For parks with Waste-Water Treatment Plants (WWTP’s) that serve surrounding communities, how is that funding returned to the State? Does that artificially inflate the cost of sewage treatment if each site is not reimbursed? **Many of the sites that have WWTP, and serve the local community, are billed/reimbursed by a meter. However; this type of information can be investigated during the IGA phase since the agreements are made on a per-park basis.**
9. Many of the public restrooms are only open during the main operation season and are closed during the winter. Many of these restrooms only feature cold water and electric heat. Are these to be included for Core ECM #2? **Yes.** Is it the intention to expand operation to winter and/or provide hot water at each? **No.**
10. Many parks currently feature solar PV and are tied into DCNR buildings that operate year-round. Are the current solar installations sufficient to power the buildings served, or are they net metered to the entire park facility? Can any information be provided as to the current solar operation and metering structure? Would the goal of Core ECM #4 be to net meter across all meters at each park? **Current solar installations vary across the state from demonstration-size, to building-**

size, to whole-park net metering size. ESCOs should determine what ECMs to include in their quotations. Inclusion/exclusion will be discussed in the IGA phase with the selected ESCO. The ultimate decision will be in the hands of Forestry, Parks and DCNR Executives. However, do not include demonstration-size solar arrays.

11. Many of the park operating facilities are oil fired. Are they to be considered under Core ECM #2? **Yes.**
12. Are there any known state regulations surrounding the implementation of lake geothermal? While many lakes are recreational use, are there any requirements from other state or federal entities that may restrict this process? **As long as it is a closed loop system and propylene glycol, or water, is used as a refrigerant, there seem to be no DEP regulations against it. There may be some necessary notifications (not permits) that need to be done as well. This can further researched during the IGA phase.**



---

Rebecca Tomlinson, RFQ Coordinator  
Energy & Resource Management Office

PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF BULLETIN BY EMAIL RESPONSE TO BECKY TOMLINSON AT: [retomlinso@pa.gov](mailto:retomlinso@pa.gov)