Addendum No. 4 Issued – November 21, 2017

From: SONOMA COUNTY WASTE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

To: COMPANIES THAT ATTENDED THE MANDATORY PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE

ADDENDUM NO. 4: Request for Proposals for Organic Materials Processing Services

Notice is hereby given that this Addendum No. 4 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.

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:

We are aware of the recent catastrophic fires, the unprecedented needs of the survivors in the SCWMA service area and subsequent re-prioritization of public resources. We are awaiting the critical decision from the City of Santa Rosa regarding our qualification for a Letter of Intent to negotiate for the site lease for our proposed SCWMA Organics Materials Processing Facilities. Could the due date for submission of Proposals in response to the RFP be extended at least March 13, 2018?

and

Given the fire tragedies and time for City land lease intent letter, is the County [sic] considering an update to the proposal dates for both the proposal submission due date and the estimated feedstock agreement intent letters?

Your concerns are acknowledged; however, the SCWMA will not be extending the deadline any further.

The SCWMA cannot speak for the County of Sonoma.

Question 2:

Who will be on the evaluation committee and what role do they currently fulfill with SCWMA/the organization they represent?

The members of the evaluation committee have not yet been determined, but may include staff of the SCWMA or its member agencies, or members of the board of the SCWMA. The evaluation committee will not include consultants.

Addendum No. 4

Issued –November 21, 2017

Question 3:

Line 158:

Are we responsible for processing pressure treated wood that is not accepted at the landfill?

No. Please see definition of Mixed Organic Materials in Draft Service Agreement:

1.30 Mixed Organic Materials means fruits, vegetables, grain products, dairy products, meat, seafood, napkins, acceptable food packaging items such as pizza boxes, paper towels, compostable food packaging (meeting the standards established by ASTM 6400 and ATRM 6868), compostable bags, waxed cardboard and food soiled paper products, and other compostable food scraps generated at residential premises from normal household activity, including kitchen fats and greases (not oil), wood crates, ivy, palm, yucca and cactus, grass cuttings, weeds, leaves, pruning, branches, dead plants, brush tree trimmings, dead trees (on average not more than twelve (12) inches in diameter) and four (4) feet in length, and similar materials generated at Premises, separated and set out for Collection, processing, and Recycling. The requested materials do not include materials not normally produced from gardens or landscapes, such as, but not limited to, brick, rock, gravel, large quantities of dirt, concrete, sod, non-Organic Materials, oil, and painted or treated wood or wood products.

Question 4:

Line 187:

This line appears to be incomplete. Please clarify.

RFP Section 1.4 is hereby revised as follows:

Implement environmentally progressive diversion programs that meet AB 939, AB 187 1826, AB 1383 and AB 1594 requirements and address achievement of the State's 75% diversion goal and the SCWMA diversion goal of 70%.; and

Question 5:

Line 770:

The link to SCWMA's web site does not work. Please clarify.

RFP Section 4.19 is hereby revised as follows:

Any addenda issued in conjunction with this RFP must be submitted as part of the original proposal packet with a wet signature. Any addenda will be posted to the SCWMA's website at http://www.recyclenow.org/agency/requests_for_proposals.asp.

Addendum No. 4

Issued –November 21, 2017

Question 6:

Line 771:

Does SCWMA want us to include in Section 1 of our proposal all pages of all addenda issued, a signed 1st page of each addenda, and a signed addenda acknowledgment sheet for each addendum issued? Also, do all signatures have to be wet and in blue ink? Please clarify.

No. Please just include the signed addenda acknowledgement sheet in Section 1 of your proposal. Yes, all signatures on the original proposal must be wet and in blue ink. The remaining six copies do not need to be wet.

Question 7:

Line 791:

Form L (Performance Bond language) does not appear to have been included with Attachment C Forms. Please provide Form L, so our Commitment Letter complies with the required language. Also, are there Forms H, I, J, and K? If yes, please provide these forms.

Please see the answer to Addendum #3, Question #1:

RFP Section 4.21 is hereby revised as follows:

A performance bond in the form as set forth in Form <u>G</u> <u>L</u> of Section 6 of this RFP (Attachment C) is required from the successful Proposer(s) within ten (10) calendar days from the date the SCWMA Board approves the Agreement(s) in an amount of One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000).

Question 8:

Lines 900-903:

State not to include costs in the electronic submittal of the proposal but to submit them in a separate electronic file. Please confirm it is okay to include costs in the seven hard copies in Section 6. Forms, but to separate them from the proposal in the electronic submittal.

Yes, that is accurate.

Question 9:

Line 904:

Does original signature mean wet signature?

One copy of the proposal should be the original, with wet signatures in blue ink.

Question 10:

Line 926:

Table 4 on Page 33 shows the Executive Summary is Section 2; however, Line 952 states the Executive Summary should be included as a component of Section 1. Please clarify.

RFP Section 5.5 is hereby revised as follows (next page):

SECTION	TABLE 4 OUTLINE FOR PROPOSAL
1	COVER LETTER
	PROPOSAL BOND
	PERFORMANCE BOND COMMITMENT LETTER
	TABLE OF CONTENTS
	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
2	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY QUALIFICATIONS
3	STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL QUALIFICATIONS
4	TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
5	FORMS
6	SERVICE EXCEPTIONS/ALTERNATIVES (if applicable)
7	APPENDIX

Question 11:

Can two of the attendee companies bid on the RFP as a JV company under a different name?

Yes, provided that both attendee companies' names and affiliations are clearly stated in the Cover Letter and Executive Summary of the proposal.

Question 12:

Will the County evaluate the proposals submitted to the City of Santa Rosa and use any portion of those proposals in the evaluation of final submittals?

and

How, if at all, will use of the City land weigh on the total evaluation of submitted responses to the RFP?

The SCWMA cannot speak for the County regarding proposal evaluation. The SCWMA is not involved at all in the City of Santa Rosa's RFP process evaluation and does not intend to evaluate responses to the Santa Rosa RFP in the SCWMA RFP. If a potential proposer is selected by Santa Rosa, the potential proposer will still be required to respond in full to the SCWMA's RFP to be considered by the SCWMA. Potential proposers utilizing sites other than those owned by the City of Santa Rosa are not affected by this process. No preferential treatment is given to a site solely because of participation in the City of Santa Rosa RFP.

Issued –November 21, 2017

Question 13:

Does the County foresee being the CEQA Lead Agency for both the County and City approvals?

The SCWMA cannot speak for the County of Sonoma and is unaware of the County's CEQA Lead Agency consideration with regard to this RFP.

Question 14:

In addendum #2, it was stated that no specific weighting of evaluation criteria was available at that time, other than what is described in the RFP. Has the SCWMA reviewed any further weighting criteria and if not, how will the county [sic] fairly evaluate the responses if a weighting criteria is not used?

The evaluation criteria are generally described in the RFP. SCWMA has not finalized a specific weighting of evaluation criteria, though the SCWMA will evaluate responses fairly and with consideration for the best interests of its member agencies, their residents and businesses.

Clarification of SCWMA and City of Santa Rosa RFP Processes:

The SCWMA does not give any bonus consideration for sites selected by the City of Santa Rosa for further negotiations, nor does the SCWMA penalize sites solely because they are not Cityowned parcels. SCWMA recognizes that there are many synergistic aspects to locating an organics processing facility in close proximity a wastewater treatment plant, but this does not preclude organics processing facilities on other locations from having potentially greater suitability and cost-effectiveness benefits.

However, since these two RFP processes are running simultaneously, the SCWMA offers these clarifications:

- Santa Rosa to issue Notice(s) of Intent to Negotiate, tentatively set for Board of Public Utilities consideration on December 7, 2017;
- o SCWMA RFP responses due to SCWMA on January 16, 2018;
- SCWMA reviews proposals, potentially including those receiving an Notice of Intent to Negotiate from the City of Santa Rosa;
- SCWMA enters into agreement(s) with existing organics processing facilities and/or issues SCWMA Notice(s) of Intent to Negotiate with RFP respondents;
- If one or more of the SCWMA-selected respondents had received a Notice of Intent to Negotiate from the City of Santa Rosa, respondents finalize negotiations with the City of Santa Rosa, in addition to any other permitting requirements required to utilize the site; and
- After those prerequisites are fulfilled, SCWMA enters into one or more long-term agreements with selected, permitted respondent.

Addendum No. 4

Issued –November 21, 2017

All Applicants are required to sign this page of this Addendum No. 4, 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. 4 DATE: 1	November 21, 2017
COMPANY / AGENCY NAME:	
COMPANY ADDRESS:	
REPRESENTATIVE'S NAME:	
SIGNATURE:	
DATE:	