

UNION COUNTY RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAM

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

For a Developer of Photovoltaic Systems with respect to certain Local Government Facilities in the County of Union, New Jersey dated August 31, 2010

Summary of Questions and Answers No. 3, Issued on October 26, 2010

Below is a summary of the questions posed by Respondents and the Union County Improvement Authority's (the "Authority") responses to said questions. This document shall be posted on the Union County Improvement Authority's website at <http://www.ucianj.org/>, and emailed to all Respondent Contact Persons.

Q1. *Given the absence of actual utility bills for the 46 sites, is there an aggregate offset number or avoided cost of electricity that the proposed PPA price must get below in order to conform with the bid requirements?*

A1. New Jersey law prohibits government entities from entering into a power purchase agreement where the PPA price exceeds the local utility tariff rate, therefore, Respondents must propose a PPA price that is less than the tariff rate offered by the local utility. That said, the Authority is hopeful it will receive a PPA price that represents a substantial reduction below the local utility tariff rate. However, please note that there is no specific target PPA rate that the Authority is anticipating or requiring.

Q2. *Can the Authority please confirm whether all 46 sites are in PSE&G or if some (please specify) are in JCP&L service territory?*

A2. The local utility provider for each site is as follows:

Local Units	Utility
Cranford	PSEG
Twp of Hillside	PSEG
City of Linden	PSEG
Mountainside BOE	PSEG
Winfield Twp BOE	PSEG
City of Plainfield	PSEG
Twp of Springfield	PSEG
Garwood BOE	PSEG
Roselle Park BOE	PSEG

Morris Union Jointure	JCPL
New Providence BOE	JCPL
Hillside BOE	PSEG
Rahway	PSEG
Boro of Roselle	PSEG
Union County	PSEG
Union County College	PSEG
Roselle BOE	PSEG

Q3. *We are requesting a two week extension of the RFP due date since other RFP's that were due prior to this RFP and extended longer than anticipated have utilized our team resources and we need more time to finish our response to the Union County RFP and to provide a proper response.*

A3. The Proposal Due Date was extended pursuant to Addendum No. 2, dated October 1, 2010. **The new Proposal Due Date is now November 3, 2010.**

Q4. *After review some sites are not acceptable for any solar installation of any efficiency or quantity. Do we still have to propose for those sites or can we propose an alternative for increasing capacity at other sites?*

A4. Respondents are required to propose solar for all Local Unit Facilities included in the RFP.

This Questions and Answers No. 3, dated October 26, 2010, has been issued and posted on the Authority's website by order of Charlotte DeFilippo, Executive Director, Union County Improvement Authority, this 26th day of October 2010.