Addendum No. 1 Issued – July 7, 2017

From: SONOMA COUNTY WASTE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

To: COMPANIES THAT ATTENDED THE MANDATORY PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE

ADDENDUM NO. 1: Request for Proposals for Organic Materials Processing Services

Notice is hereby given that this Addendum No. 1 is provided to the companies represented at the Mandatory Pre-Proposal Conference held on June 28, 2017, and that the clarifications, additions and/or deletions contained in this Addendum shall be made part of the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the above-referenced project, and shall be subject to all applicable requirements there-under, as if originally shown and/or specified.

<u>Companies in Attendance at Mandatory Pre-Proposal Conference</u>

Notice is hereby given that the following companies were represented at the Mandatory Pre-Proposal Conference held on June 28, 2017:

- BioMRF Technologies, Inc.
- California Compost
- Cold Creek Compost, Inc.
- Daniel O. Davis, Inc.
- DVO, Inc.
- EcoloCap Solutions Inc.
- Entsorga USA Inc.
- Herb of California
- Hitachi Zosen Inova USA, LLC
- Managed Organic Recycling, Inc.
- MTR
- Napa Recycling & Waste Services
- Recology Inc.

- Renewable Sonoma
- Soiland Co Inc.
- Stage Gulch Organics
- StormFisher Environmental Ltd
- Sustainable Alternative Feed Enterprises (SAFE)
- Synagro
- Synergy Private Equity LLC (DBA Synergy Composting & Synergy Anaerobic Digestion)
- Valoriza Servicios Medioambientales (Sacyr Environment USA LLC)
- Vision Recycling
- Waste Management

Change in Due Date for Submission of Proposals

Notice is hereby given that the due date for submission of Proposals in response to the RFP is being extended to <u>October 18, 2017 by 11:00 a.m. PDT</u>. The due date is no longer August 16, 2017 by 11:00 a.m. PDT, as was originally stated in various sections throughout the RFP document.

The last day to submit questions is also being extended to <u>September 8, 2017 by 11:00 a.m. PDT</u>. The due date is no longer July 26, 2017 by 11:00 a.m. PDT, as was originally stated in various sections throughout the RFP document.

Addendum No. 1 Issued – July 7, 2017

Questions Submitted in Response to the RFP

The following questions were submitted in response to the original RFP document issued on May 31, 2017. The SCWMA's response is provided below each question, and information is provided regarding any corresponding revisions, additions, or deletions that are hereby made to the text of the original RFP document and Agreement.

Question 1:

a. What is the tonnage handled by each transfer station?

The tonnage handled by each transfer station will vary from 2016 due to the limitation of organics collection and transport from the Central Disposal Site. Therefore, SCWMA does not believe these details will provide Proposers with information necessary to complete a successful proposal.

Given that disclaimer, the following is a list of transfer stations and the percentage of the total wood waste and comingled yard debris and residential food waste tonnage handled in 2016 as calculated by SCWMA from reports by Republic Services.

Transfer Station	2016 Tonnage %
Annapolis Transfer Station	0.3%
Central Disposal Site	52.2%
Guerneville Transfer Station	4.6%
Healdsburg Transfer Station	25.1%
Sonoma Transfer Station	17.7%

Question 2:

a. What compost facility locations is material currently being sent and what are those quantities?

See answer to Question 1 above. In addition, the following is a list of facilities that material is currently being sent and the tonnage sent to each as calculated by SCWMA from reports by the Ratto Group:

Compost Facility	2016 Tonnage
Cold Creek Compost	16,421
Napa Compost Facility	8,432
Redwood Landfill	35,783
Jepsen Prairie Organics	14,571

Question 3:

a. What is the gate rate for disposal?

Addendum No. 1 Issued – July 7, 2017

The current disposal rate is \$117.50 for self-hauled material. As noted in Section 2.5 of the RFP documents, SCWMA anticipates that additional fees will be assessed for collection of the Organic Materials tons processed from any resultant Agreement(s) from this RFP process; however, these fees should not be included in the per ton rates for Organic Materials Processing Services as proposed in Form F (Attachment D).

Question 4:

High-Quality End Products and Residuals

a. It is clear that you are looking for high-end compost however are you looking for the vendor to find an alternative market for the residues if they are greater than 10% due to the inbound contamination.

No, proposers are responsible for returning an equivalent tonnage of residuals accepted at the proposed facility to the Sonoma County landfill system. An inbound contamination measurement plan should be included as part of the proposals. See Section 5.5.4 Technical Proposal for more details.

b. In Section 3.10, the level of contamination is discussed. The concept of a tiered pricing is also contemplated. We wanted to confirm that we are understanding the approach correctly.

SCWMA encourages proposers to contemplate tiered pricing and provide a clear methodology for assessing contamination and pricing tiers. As outlined in Section 3.10 and Form F of the RFP documents, proposers may give tiered pricing per-ton rates based on total tons and term length. Use Form F-1 to propose rates for the short-term (3-Year Term) and Forms F-2 through F-4 for the long-term (10-20 Year Terms).

Question 5:

Section 2.4 Organic Material Tonnages

a. Who controls the self-haul tons?

All green waste and wood waste that is delivered to an in-county transfer station is flow controlled in County by SCWMA. However, individual haulers not bound by franchise agreements or waste delivery agreements may or may not choose to self-haul to those transfer stations, so proposers are advised to not consider self-hauled material as part of a potential future commitment of flow from the SCWMA.

Question 6:

Section 2.5 Sonoma County or SCWMA Fees

a. To confirm, the proposed facility will have to charge the \$4.85 and \$14.25 fees however they should not include it in their pricing with the submission?

<u>Do not</u> include these fees in your proposed per ton rates. Fees remain to be determined, based on the manner in which the material is delivered to the proposed facility.

Question 7:

Section 3.1 Overview of Base Services

a. Is the County willing to provide a guarantee on the quality of the inbound feedstock?

Addendum No. 1 Issued – July 7, 2017

The proposed services will be provided to the Sonoma County Waste Management Agency, to which the County is one of the ten Member Agencies.

The SCWMA will not provide a guarantee on the quality of the inbound feedstock, but as previously mentioned, SCWMA encourages proposers to contemplate tiered pricing and provide a clear methodology for assessing contamination and pricing tiers.

Question 8:

Section 3.3 Organic Materials Accepted

a. Can you elaborate on the tonnages of biosolids that require composting?

SCWMA is interested in the possibility of Proposers providing processing services for other waste streams, potentially including biosolids, manure, and other agricultural organic waste materials. While Proposers are encouraged to consider providing processing services for these materials, SCWMA has no control of these other organic material waste streams, cannot provide accurate tonnages, and cannot provide a flow commitment for these materials, nor does SCMWA intend to include processing of these other waste materials. Processing agreements for these organic materials may not be facilitated by the SCWMA, and may be considered separately from this RFP process.

Question 9:

Organic Materials Processing Agreement

a. In the Organic Materials Processing Agreement, it discusses change in law and the applicable laws. Given SB1383, AB1826, etc. does this change the tonnages that the County is anticipating needing to come out of the waste streams?

Yes, the SCWMA anticipates a change in the tonnages due to the above-mentioned state and assembly bills that have recently passed. These however, are already in effect and would not be considered a Material Change in Law as defined in the Agreement.

Question 10:

Republic Landfill Agreement

a. The goal of 80% diversion is going to require addressing the organic fraction of the MSW stream. Have you considered timing on handling this component of the waste stream beyond co-collection of green waste and food waste, commercial food waste collection, and how to handle multi-family?

The SCWMA does not control the collection agreements, which address the co-collection of green waste and food waste, commercial food waste collection and how to handle multi-family. SCWMA encourages proposers to contemplate self-haul options and provide a clear methodology for handling this component of the waste stream by material type and sector. Additionally, the SCWMA plans to work on community outreach by engaging with haulers and the selected proposer(s) from this process. SCWMA plans to increase educational outreach and examine policy to encourage additional organic material diversion.

b. How much material currently goes to the landfill for ADC and how much of it is the material that is discussed in the RFP?

The Central Disposal Site does not use organics materials for ADC.

Addendum No. 1 Issued – July 7, 2017

c. Can you elaborate on the CNG Grant Agreement?

We are unsure what this question is referring to. Please clarify and resubmit this question.

d. Can you share the GHG baseline study?

The SCWMA does not have a GHG baseline study.

e. Is there a plan to process MSW to remove the recyclables and organic fraction at the MRF?

SCWMA staff is unaware of any plans to further process MSW beyond what is already occurring at the County-owned transfer stations. The MRF at Central Transfer Station was constructed to process construction and demolition debris, and dry commercial mixed waste (i.e., no wet organics).

f. Is the County planning on using the submissions on organics to response to Cal Recycle for the August 1st submission?

We are unsure what this question is referring to. Please clarify and resubmit this question.

g. The \$7.50 per ton fee is different than the fees outlined in the RFP docs. Does this also need to be added into the financials?

See answer to Question 6.a. above.

h. Are you going to ask the proposers to put up any financial assurance beyond the \$1M bond?

No. Refer to Article 7 of the draft SCWMA Organic Materials Processing Agreement.

i. To confirm that the 27 acres discussed in Exhibit B of the agreement is not available for this project or any related uses?

The SCWMA has no committed properties or acreage available for this project. Proposer are required to secure sites without assistance from the SCWMA.

j. In Exhibit R, are these payments outlined earlier in the RFP or should we be reviewing this exhibit as well?

See answer to Question 6.a. above.

k. In Exhibit S, are these payments also required to be factored into the responses?

See answer to Question 6.a. above.

I. In Exhibit T, are these payments also required to be factored into the responses?

See answer to Question 6.a. above.

Question 11:

Form A: Communication Protocol

a. Are proposers that signed Form A: Communication Protocol able to communicate with other companies that attended the Pre-Proposal Conference to coordinate a team venture?

As a point of clarification, Form A: Communication Protocol is not intended to prevent participants from developing the best proposal possible. The intent is to acknowledge that all communication between participants and the SCWMA during the procurement process shall be in writing, either by email or mail to Patrick Carter as indicated on Form A: Communication Protocol.

Addendum No. 1 Issued – July 7, 2017

Form A: Communication Protocol prevents communication between the listed parties and the SCWMA, other than the designated contact. It does not prevent the listed parties from forming partnerships, etc. before or after the date signed.

b. Can the City of Santa Rosa provide all the available information (Geotech, EA1, EA2, zoning etc.) for the sites identified in the letter from the City of Santa Rosa of May 31, 2017 (also part of the RFP documents)?

The City of Santa Rosa (City) will be conducting a request for proposals (RFP) process simultaneously with SCWMA's RFP process for the use of land adjacent to the City's Laguna Treatment Plant located at 4300 Llano Road. The City's RFP is tentatively scheduled to be released July 17, 2017 and will be distributed to all companies represented at the Mandatory Pre-Proposal Conference held on June 28, 2017. The City anticipates providing selected Proposer(s) with a Letter of Intent to Negotiate to be included in the Proposer's submission to SCWMA. Receipt of a Letter of Intent to Negotiate from the City will only be used to demonstrate the potential for securing a site on which Proposer may operate and does not constitute any special status with regard to the SCWMA's RFP process. Notification of selection by the City is anticipated for early September with final, approved Letters of Intent to be distributed by September 21, 2017. If Proposer chooses to participate in the City's RFP process for the purpose of securing a right to operate on City-owned land, Proposer does so at its own risk and may wish to consider an alternate site in the event of non-selection by the City. Proposer shall have no further recourse through the SCWMA if Proposer's only viable site is located on City parcel(s) and is not selected by the City in its RFP process.

Questions regarding the use of this land and the City's process can be directed to Mike Prinz at MPrinz@srcity.org.

Addendum No. 1 Issued – July 7, 2017

THEREFORE: All Applicants are required to sign this page of this Addendum No. 1, and shall submit a signed copy of this page with their Proposal package.

Thank you for your participation,

Sonoma County Waste Management Agency Patrick Carter Executive Director

ADDENDUM NO. 1 DATE: Ju	uly 7, 2017	
COMPANY / AGENCY NAME:		
COMPANY ADDRESS:		
REPRESENTATIVE'S NAME:		
SIGNATURE:		
DATE:		