

Navy Yard LED Street & Area Lighting Upgrade Manufacturer Equipment RFP

Addendum B – Questions & Answers

June 15th, 2026

- 1. Please forward the basis of design – specs, etc. – as we are interested in bidding.**
 - No MFR or PN - Decorative Post-Top LED Luminaires/Replacements (9K-13K lm) - Qty 653**
 - Selux - SACL series retrofit/control retrofit items - Qty 185-192**
 - No MFR or PN - Decorative Pendant LED Luminaires and Arms (9K-13K lm) - Qty 27**
 - No MFR or PN - Decorative Post-Top/Wall Luminaires (5K-13K lm) - Qty 12-21**
 - No MFR or PN - Cobrahead Street & Area Luminaires (4K-28K lm) - Qty 215 each type**
 - No MFR or PN - Network Lighting Control System (cellular LMS/NLC) - Qty 1264**
 - No MFR or PN - Photocells (standard, UL, dimming versions) - Qty 1264**

All available information is provided in the vendor submittal worksheet and also referenced in the pre-bid meeting presentation. Basis of design specs will not be provided. Sufficient information has been provided for manufacturers to submit what they believe are their best solutions meeting the RFP requests. The RFP also allows manufacturers to submit what they deem as the solution that best meets the request as well as alternate solutions they think should be considered.

- 2. Can PIDC clarify how “closest aesthetic match to existing transitional style” will be evaluated? Are there specific visual characteristics (e.g., form factor, finish, mounting style, or overall appearance) that proposers should prioritize?**

Form factor/style and finish/color are key characteristics that would be considered when evaluating a close “match.” If manufacturers believe that they have multiple solutions that could be considered a close “match,” the vendor submittal worksheet allows for multiple solutions to be provided which will be evaluated and considered. Existing poles will be reused so matching the mounting methods used with existing luminaires should be considered a requirement. For Crescent Park, assume the post-top luminaire solution(s) could mount to a 3.5” to 4” OD pole. If an adapter is required to meet these criteria, they should be included in the submitted part # and price.

3. Will aesthetic alignment be incorporated into the evaluation criteria, or is it considered a minimum requirement for responsiveness during proposal review?

Yes, aesthetic matches will be considered in the evaluation of solutions. All solutions will be measured on the same criteria defined in the RFP. See the above for comments on submitting alternate options.

4. The Pricing section of the Submittal Worksheet includes “adder” columns BAA and BABA compliant products which suggests non-compliant and foreign manufactured imported products are acceptable for submission. What if any preference is given to US manufactured product?

We assume that manufacturers will submit solutions from their primary standard manufacturing locations. We are not requiring US manufactured products but will gain insight into the price premium via the BAA and BABA adders requested. We anticipate that any low-quality solutions will be vetted through the entirety of all information requested and evaluated from RFP responses.

5. Are there any product compliance requirements like those found on the US governments BAA / BABA acts?

See above. At this time, this project does not plan on using funding that requires BABA or BAA certifications. We request price adders for BAA and BABA compliance if these are required or if PIDC prefers domestic assembly or manufacturing.

6. Is consideration given to products with superior photometric performance which improves the quality of the lighting and safety and/or lower energy consumption for the PIDC Navy Yard?

Yes. We have multiple ways to fairly compare all submitted solutions for all criteria. One example is when determining long term energy costs for a product we will adjust all solutions to the same lumen output and adjust wattage accordingly. This methodology would identify differences between solutions with significantly different lumens/watt. We use other required information to assess lighting quality (e.g. source brightness). If at any point, we have solutions that seem very similar, we may reach out to manufacturers to request clarifications or additional information.

7. Where can details on improved performance and other benefits not included within the Submittal Worksheet categories be communicated?

The only place for this type of additional information would be in the final response on the General Information tab. We do believe that all the information requested in the entirety of the RFP will give us sufficient information to evaluate solutions. If at any point, we see attributes that we think are relevant to our evaluation, we may reach out to manufacturers to request clarifications or additional information.

- 8. For TM 21 lifetime projections L70, please confirm whether the project requires documentation of the in-situ LED case temperature (Tc) under worst-case operating conditions. If required, please clarify:**
- a. Whether Tc should be evaluated at a specific ambient temperature condition (e.g., 25°C or 40°C), and**
 - b. Whether this data should be included as part of the TM 21/LM 80 submittal package.**

The TM-21 worksheets should represent standard reporting requirements, including at least LM-80 test data inputs for both 55°C and 85°C Case Temperatures. We are specifically interested in the CALCULATED/PROJECTED lumen depreciation at 70%. We are not looking for REPORTED L70 life ratings. Specifically, we are looking for the hours entered into cell I40 of the TM-21 Inputs tab representing "Time (t) at which to estimate lumen maintenance (hours):" that will generate 70% in cell I41 representing "Lumen maintenance at time (t) (%):" For reference, we are not interested in the result in cell I42.

9. Is there any PENNDOT requirement on any of these fixtures?

No. The project is not using PENNDOT Liquid Fuel Funds. We do ask for the cobrahead luminaires about PennDOT Bulletin 15 approval for reference. Neither decorative luminaires or controls are included in Bulletin 15.

10. Has the list of electrical distributors been selected and will you be advising us of that?

The Distribution Services RFP is running concurrently to the Manufacturer RFP. Once a preferred distribution partner and preferred manufacturers (by product category) are identified we will do a check in to make sure all parties have good working relationships with each other. Based on the RFP evaluation process and criteria, we expect working with very qualified partners that typically have good working relationships within the lighting industry.

11. Who will be handling staging/storage of this material?

The selected distributor will receive manufacturer shipments and coordinate with the selected contractor (via the construction bid) to coordinate staging/storage and deliveries.

**12. On the steel trellis, could you advise the dimensions of the current mounting?
Assuming these will be using the existing mounting.**

This information is not available. Manufacturers should assume that they will need to provide a mounting bracket used on a flat surface (e.g. square pole adapter). The structure is wider than any typical square pole, so standard adapters should be assumed.

13. Will pricing provided need to be guaranteed through 2028, per your timeline?

Yes, committed pricing needs to be held firm until 12/31/2028. We do expect the material ordering to start, at the latest, in the 4th quarter of 2026 with most of the remaining to follow in 2027. Our goal is to complete the project in 2027 or early 2028.

14. If manufacturers have both standard and higher efficiency (LPW) luminaire options, which one should be submitted.

There are two ways that vendors could submit options as you describe. One approach would be to submit the standard efficiency solution as the first solution and put the same luminaire with the higher efficiency package as one of the offered alternate solutions. A manufacturer could also submit the one solution that they anticipate will generate the lowest Total Cost of Ownership (TCO). Since TCO is based on purchase price + 20 years of energy costs + 20 years of maintenance costs, a vendor could determine if the price premium for the high efficiency option is less than the incremental energy savings over 20 years it would generate. If manufacturers want to proactively anticipate the best TCO solution, they could assume 4,380 annual operating hours and an average \$0.1032/kWh.

15. Can a manufacturer submit a mesh-based RF network lighting management system solution?

Yes. You will need to make all the possible components (e.g. gateway(s)) are represented in the vendor submittal, including both technical specifications and pricing. We provide the ability for a vendor to clarify pricing with comments in the last column of the Network Control tab. For example, if a gateway(s) is a one-time cost, it could be entered into the Annual Other Unit D/N Cost column and it could be clarified in the final column that this is cost is one-time and not annual.

- 16. Do you know the spacing between the poles?**
- a. Would it be possible to get the layout as an .AGI file?**
 - b. This request only applies to the decorative post tops.**

Manufacturers are not being asked to complete photometrics. This information is not available.

- 17. Confirmation on what is meant by Level 2 Vibration testing in the worksheet. Is this different from 3G?**

This reference is asked in the context of a price adder for a Level 2 Vibration specification. In this context, it should be assumed that Level 1 is for standard roadway installations and Level 2 would be for bridges, overpasses, heavy traffic corridors. This Level 2 reference reflects an industry-standard classification, not an ANSI standard definition. For the purposes of this RFP vendors can assume Level 2 and ANSI C136.31 3G rated as equivalent. It is unlikely that we will need Level 2 or ANSI C136.31 3G rated for this project.