

Addendum to the Request for Proposals to Transport Compostable Materials for the Sonoma County Waste Management Agency

1. What processing facilities does the authority anticipate authorizing?

Due to transportation distances and facility capacity concerns, the following facilities are under consideration: Redwood Landfill Compost Facility (SWIS #21-AA-0001), Cold Creek Compost (SWIS # 23-AA-0029), City of Napa Compost Facility (SWIS # 28-AA-0023), Jepson Prairie Compost Facility (SWIS # 48-AA-0048), and West Contra Costa County Sanitary Landfill Compost Facility (SWIS # 07-AA-0044). If the successful PROPOSER requests the use of alternate facilities, it must first receive written permission from AGENCY prior to delivery of compostable materials to said facility.

2. What period of time is considered seasonal?

If AGENCY decides to use the services of the successful PROPOSER on a seasonal basis, it is expected that such services would be necessary from October 1 to April 30.

3. What volume would be associated with the season?

Please see historical data for Compostable Materials from October 1 to April 30 below:

Year	October – April Tonnage
2009-10	56,413.95
2010-11	54,320.08
2011-12	55,251.32
2012-13	58,633.52
2013-14	55,750.97

4. Will the material be ground or otherwise size reduced prior to loading for transport?

It is the intent to provide the successful PROPOSER with ground material to reduce the number of trucks necessary to transport compostable material. Barring any unforeseen equipment failures, the material will be ground prior to loading for transport.

5. Will the contractor be responsible for loading his own trucks?

AGENCY/third party contractor will load the successful PROPOSER's trucks.

6. Will the transfer station be responsible for positioning trailers for loading?

AGENCY/third party contractor will be responsible for directing in the traffic flow at the Central Disposal Site Compost Facility.

7. How many days per week would the contractor be able to transfer loads?

The Solid Waste Facility Permit for the Central Disposal Site Compost Facility allows operations Monday – Saturday from 7 am to 3 pm.

8. What are the transfer station's hours of operation?

Please see the response to question 7.

9. Can additional trailers be staged for after hours hauling?

Additional trailers may be staged for loading during the ancillary hours of operation for the facility, which are 6 am to 6:30 pm, 7 days per week, but may not be hauled off-site other than the schedule listed in the response to question 7.

10. Typically, a fidelity bond is use where cash is being handled by the contractor's employees. Since no cash is being handled by the contractor, would the Authority consider eliminating the fidelity bond requirement?

AGENCY will delete this provision.

11. The first two bullet points in Exhibit B requires a description of, "Procedures for identifying and handling hazardous waste disposed of in organic materials.." and "Plan for minimizing contamination of organic materials." These appear to apply to the collection contractor, the transfer facility operator, and the processing facility operator. The transfer hauler has no control over what the collection contractor collects or the transfer facility operator loads for transfer. Would the Authority consider deleting these two requirements?

Agency will delete these provisions.

12. In Exhibit D Agreement for Organic Materials Transport Services Section 9.2 CERCLA Defense Records (page 19). This subsection discusses both transfer and disposal of organic material where in the revised proposal, the term transfer has been removed. Should the term transfer be removed?

AGENCY agrees and has amended Exhibit D to reflect this change.

13. In Exhibit D Agreement for Organic Materials Transport Services, Section 12.2 Service Performance Standards: Liquidated Damages for Failure to Meet Standards (page 24) Item C. in the 12.2 table list the following item: Failure to maintain proper covers on transfer vehicles. Would it not be more accurate to change this to disposal vehicles?

Transfer has been changed to "transport" vehicle, as transportation (or variation thereof) is a defined term in the agreement, while transfer was not.

14. In Section 1.2 Background and Overview of Requested Services (page 2), The selected PROPOSER would collect all compostable materials from the Central Disposal Site compost facility deliver said materials to an AGENCY-approved Compost Facility or Facilities. The

statement: The selected PROPOSER will collect all compostable materials implies that the PROPOSER may need to properly identify and separate all compostable material and load the material onto disposal vehicles. Is this the intention of this statement?

No, the successful PROPOSER must transport the materials which it collects from the Central Disposal Site compost facility to an AGENCY-approved Compost Facility. Identification and separation of compostable material are not the responsibility of the successful PROPOSER.

15. In Section 1.2 Background and Overview of Requested Services (page 2), The selected PROPOSER would collect all compostable materials from the Central Disposal Site compost facility deliver said materials to an AGENCY-approved Compost Facility or Facilities. (Note: The conjunction 'and' seems to be missing from this statement). Will the AGENCY provide a list of AGENCY-approved Compost Facility or Facilities?

Please see response to question #1.

16. In Exhibit A Proposed Scope of Services (page 9) and Exhibit D Agreement for Organic Materials Transport Services (page 14) (Definitions) the statement: The selected PROPOSER would collect all compostable materials from the Central Disposal Site compost facility and deliver said materials to an AGENCY-approved Compost Facility or Facilities. Will the AGENCY provide a list of AGENCY-approved Compost Facility or Facilities?

Please see response to question #1.

17. In Exhibit D Agreement for Organic Materials Transport Services (page 14) (Definitions) the statement: an Agency-approved Compost Facility or Facilities (Exhibits A and D refer to Disposal Site(s) are listed in Exhibit C implies that the Agency approved Disposal Site(s) are listed in Exhibit C of Exhibit D. Will the AGENCY provide a list of AGENCY-approved Compost Facility or Facilities?

Please see response to question #1.

18. Under Section 11.2.4. of Exhibit D (Page 21 of RFP), Employee Blanket Fidelity Bond of the RFP, it is stated that \$500,000 per employee, covering dishonesty, forgery, alteration, theft, disappearance, destruction (inside or outside); or, Commercial Crime Insurance with limits of liability of not less than \$1,000,000 per occurrence. However, the industry standard is to insure per single loss not per employee. Please clarify.

Please see response to question #10.

19. Under Section 11.4.3. of Exhibit D (Page 21 of RFP) and elsewhere within Section 11, the RFP requires endorsements to name the Agency as a loss payee. In order to do this, the Agency must have an insurable interest. It is not clear how the Agency would have an insurable interest. Please clarify or remove this requirement.

This requirement has been removed.

20. It is not clear if the Agency-approved Compost Facility or Facilities are to be located within or outside of Sonoma County. Can the Compost Facility or Facilities be located either within or outside of Sonoma County?

Please see response to question #1.

21. It is not clear whether the Agency or the PROPOSER provides a list of proposed Compost Facilities to accept compostable materials generated in Sonoma County, the available capacity of each facility, the cost per ton of compostable material to transport to each facility, and the associated tipping fee for each facility. On page 1, Section 1.1, under both Scenarios 2 and 3, the RFP reads: to an AGENCY-approved Compost Facility or Facilities implying that a list of Agency-approved facilities may already be developed. Please clarify.

Please see response to question #1.

22. It is not clear if the PROPOSER will be loading material onto transport vehicles as the RFP appears to be focused on transport and delivery of compostable materials only. If the PROPOSER will be loading material onto transport vehicles, is the PROPOSER expected to provide loading equipment or to contract out with the Agency or with the current operator at the Central Disposal Site? Otherwise, the RFP should clearly state that the Agency or its current operator at the Central Disposal Site will provide for loading logistics.

Please see the response to question #5.

23. In reference to Exhibit B: Proposal Evaluation Criteria (Page 10 of RFP), will preference provided to local businesses as is the policy of Sonoma County? It would be expected that local business would have their base of operations located within Sonoma County.

The AGENCY has a Local Business Preference as it is related to the purchase of supplies and equipment. This RFP is for the transport of materials, not for the purchase of supplies or equipment. The AGENCY is a separate government entity from the County of Sonoma, and as such, the County of Sonoma's local business policies do not apply to this RFP.

24. In Exhibit D of the RFP (page 17), Section 3.6 Ownership of Organic Materials. Once Organic Materials are deposited by Contractor at a Disposal Site or Processing Site, such materials shall become the property of the Owner or operator of the facility implies that at some spatial or temporal point, the organic material ownership changes from the Agency to the operator of the receiving facility. Please explain exactly where or when material ownership changes. Is it once the material is loaded onto the transport vehicle at the Central Disposal Site, during transport, once receiving facility operator begins unloading operations, after all material has been removed from the transport vehicle or some other point?

The successful PROPOSER assumes ownership of the material to be transported upon receipt in the transport vehicle. However, PROPOSER must deliver these materials to the AGENCY approved compost facility(ies). The agreement has been amended to reflect this clarification.

25. In Exhibit D of the RFP (page 17), Section 11.2 Minimum Limits of Insurance. It appears that the Commercial General Liability (Section 11.2.1), Automobile Liability (Section 11.2.2) and Pollution Legal Liability (Section 11.2.5) are higher than the current contractual requirements for waste hauling within the jurisdiction of Sonoma County. Is this due to additional insurance requirements to haul outside of Sonoma County to as of yet unnamed composting facilities or some other factor?

This Request for Proposals is separate from any agreement between PROPOSER and the County of Sonoma, and the insurance requirements are similar to those researched by AGENCY in other franchise agreements. If PROPOSER wishes to propose the amounts be lowered, PROPOSER may do so in their proposal. A proposal which demonstrates how the alteration of any requirement in this proposed agreement affects the rate charged to AGENCY is much more easily evaluated by AGENCY than one which does not.

26. In Exhibit B: Proposal Evaluation Criteria, under Exhibit B Question 1 Compostable Material Transport Approach, the bullet: Manufacturer's specification for collection vehicles is confusing. Collection vehicles are vastly different than transport vehicles and this RFP does not mention in the Scope of Services that material will need to be collected. Please clarify. Exhibit B has been amended to reflect transport instead of collection.

27. Regarding the statement under Section 1.2 Background and Overview of Requested Services (page 1): The County's contractor currently transports compostable material from the Transfer Stations to the Central Disposal Site composting facility. This contract will expire upon notice from the County to Republic Services that the Master Operating Agreement is effective. What is the significance of this statement and how might it affect the term of agreement for this RFP?

The line regarding the MOA has been deleted from the MOA as it is not relevant to this RFP.

28. The Title of the RFP is to Transport Compostable Materials for the SCWMA; however at various points within the RFP and its exhibits, the terms collection and transfer are used. Please clarify that this RFP is for transport only and does not include operationally and logistically activities such as collection, loading, sorting, grinding, processing and transfer. Please see the revised definition of collection in Exhibit D for clarification.

29. On page 6 of the RFP, Section 3.3.c) AGENCY Environmental Review, will CEQA or other environmental review processes impact the PROPOSER in developing it Implementation Plan?

CEQA review is not expected to impact PROPOSER in a material way, though certainty cannot be provided until CEQA review is complete.

30. In Exhibit B: Proposal Evaluation Criteria (page 10), the first bullet item under Question 1 states: Procedures for identifying and handling hazardous waste disposed in organic materials collected in the performance of these services. The plan shall describe: identification and screening procedures; notification plan; disposal plan; and, employee training program. What screening processes is the PROPOSER responsible for? At what point does the screening take place? What is the specific materials, i.e., hazardous materials disposed in organic materials that should be screened for? What specific materials is the PROPOSER to collect?

Please see response to question #11.

31. In Exhibit B: Proposal Evaluation Criteria (page 10), the second bullet item under Question 1 states: Plan for minimizing contamination of organic materials. At what point in the transport of the organic materials must a plan be described to minimize contamination of the materials? Is it once the materials are loaded into the transport truck? Is there screening that the PROPOSER must provide prior the loading of the material? Is there a requirement at the receiving facility? On Page 18 of Exhibit D, Section 7.3 Minimization of Contamination, the proposed agreement states that the Contractor shall use care to prevent Organic Materials from being contaminated by Contaminants during Collection or Transportation process. What are the specific Contaminates of concern? Additionally, the Section 7.3 statement implies collection or transportation, which are two different logistical and operational activities.

Regarding Exhibit B, please see response to question #11. Regarding Section 7.3 of Exhibit D, Contractor must ensure that its other uses for transport vehicles do not contaminate Organics Materials collected from AGENCY. Contaminants are a defined term in Exhibit D.

32. In Exhibit B: Proposal Evaluation Criteria (page 10) and elsewhere in the RFP, the use of the terms organic materials and compostable materials seems to be used interchangeably. Are all organic materials considered to be compostable materials? In the RFP on page 1, Section 1.1 Definitions, compostable materials is defined as any organic material that when accumulated will become active compost. However, in Exhibit D Agreement for Organic Materials Transport Services of the RFP, not only does the title of the agreement use the term Organic Material, but within the definition of the same Exhibit (page 14), compostable material is not defined, while on page 15, same section, Organic Materials is defined. It is apparent that Compostable Materials are a subset of Organic Materials. Which type of material is this RFP directed towards?

The entire RFP has been revised to reflect compostable materials instead of organic material.

33. In Exhibit B: Proposal Evaluation Criteria (page 10), the third bullet item under Question 1 states: Plan for preventing spills. It is not apparent what spills the RFP is referring to, although on Page 18 of Exhibit D, Section 7.2 Minimization of Spills, it appears that spills are organic materials, vehicle oil and vehicle fuel. Again, this Section describes activities in both collection and transport and in addition raises the specter of a "hot load" (combustion of material in the truck).

The RFP refers to the definition of spills defined in Section 7.2 of Exhibit D.

34. By definition, are Organic Materials considered to be a hot load? What are the safety precautions required to transport organic materials as compared to Compostable Materials?

Compostable Materials by themselves are not considered a hot load. Combustion of material in the truck is expected to only occur if there is an ignition source (e.g. hot coals from a fireplace or barbecue, chemical reaction, etc.). The successful PROPOSER is assumed to be the expert in the field of material transport and should be able to propose any necessary precautions to prevent nuisance or public health situations as it related to the transport of compostable materials.

35. In Exhibit B: Proposal Evaluation Criteria (page 10), the fourth bullet item under Question 1 states: Equipment to be Utilized. This bullet discusses both vehicles and equipment. What equipment aside from transport vehicles are required? Will there be loading, sorting, processing, grinding and other activities required?

Equipment is assumed to be vehicles, but if the PROPOSER wishes to include other equipment that would add value to the Proposal, it should be described in the Proposal.

36. In Exhibit B: Proposal Evaluation Criteria (page 10), the fifth bullet item under Question 1 states: Manufacturer's specification for collection vehicles. This bullet specifically states collection not transport vehicles. Will collection services be required? If so, where at and within what jurisdiction?

The successful PROPOSER will collect materials which are deposited in PROPOSER's vehicle from the Central Disposal Site compost facility.

37. In Exhibit B: Proposal Evaluation Criteria (page 10), the sixth bullet item under Question 1 states: Standard crew size (e.g., driver, helper). Is another crew member aside from the driver required for driving the transport vehicle? If so, what functions and activities are required for the helper or another crew member?

This is PROPOSER's responsibility to describe.

38. In Exhibit B: Proposal Evaluation Criteria (page 10), the seventh bullet item under Question 1 states: Location for equipment and personnel staging. What equipment and personnel will

be required to be staged? And, what is the function and tasking for the equipment and personnel? Where does the AGENCY expect the equipment and personnel to be staged? If PROPOSER requires additional equipment to carry out the functions request by AGENCY, AGENCY needs to be aware of and approve of the use of said equipment in advance. This evaluation criterion allows AGENCY to examine what accommodations are necessary to implement this program, and allows for any necessary Solid Waste Facility Permit alterations.

39. In Exhibit B: Proposal Evaluation Criteria (page 10), the eighth bullet item under Question 1 states: Preventative maintenance program for equipment. Again, what equipment will be required to transport the compostable or organic material?

Please see the response to question #38.

40. Who is the operator of the Central Compost Site? Is it possible for the PROPOSER to review the existing agreement?

The Central Compost Site operator is Sonoma Compost Company. The agreement between AGENCY and Sonoma Compost Company is a public document and available upon request. However, should the transport of compostable materials be necessary, it is expected that the AGENCY/Sonoma Compost Company agreement would need to be amended.

41. Will an agreement be required between the PROPOSER and the entity who operates the compost site to coordinate the scheduling, loading, transport and delivery of the compostable or organic material to the processing facility?

No.

42. When will the response to these questions be made available?

Prior to the PROPOSER reading this response.

43. How will we account for increases in tipping fees and other cost escalators during the term of the agreement from the effective date to February 1, 2017?

There are no escalators of tipping fees, as that is not include in the scope of this agreement. If PROPOSER requests escalator for the transport, PROPOSER must include this in their Proposal.

44. Will the AGENCY provide analysis of the impacts of potential greenhouse gas emissions to the Central Disposal Site and how that might affect Solid Waste Facility Permit 49-AA-0260 dated August 15, 2006.

Greenhouse gas emissions are included in the checklist of items examined under the California Environmental Quality Act. Should services from PROPOSER become necessary, AGENCY will perform the necessary CEQA analysis prior to execution of the agreement.

45. Has a revised permit application been submitted for the Solid Waste Facility Permit 49-AA-0260 as required by the 5-year Permit Review Report dated November 1, 2011?

Yes. The next permit review date is 11/1/2016.

46. Will transfer or transport of green, agricultural and vegetative materials be allowed under Solid Waste Facility Permit 49-AA-00260?

Yes.

47. The hours of permitted operation under the Solid Waste Facility Permit are listed for receipt of refuse/waste from 7:00 am to 4:00 pm, 7 days per week and 359 days per year with ancillary operations/facility operating hours from 6:30 am to 5:30 pm, 7 days per week, 359 days per year. First, are transport of compostable or organic material considered to ancillary operations? Second, what are the hours the PROPOSER is expected to provide transport services?

Please see the response to question #7.

48. It was noted that on June 16, 2014, an LEA inspection was performed on 3 May 2014 and reported an Area of Concern regarding that the site exceeded the total allowable number of vehicles on site based on the information in the May 2014 vehicle logs. What is the maximum allowable number of vehicles? Does it include all vehicle traffic to other activities of the Central Disposal Site? How will the maximum allowable number of vehicles affect this RFP?

The permitted traffic volume is 206 vehicles per day. Other activities on the Central Disposal Site are not counted against this permitted amount. During the time services would be needed from the successful PROPOSER, retail sales of finished compost and mulch would not occur at the Central Compost Site. As such, it is expected that the traffic amounts would be well within the permitted amount.

49. In Exhibit B: Proposal Evaluation Criteria (page 10), Question 3 requires a detailed matrix of costs for (the) scenario, not a single cost per ton. It appears that the scenario may include multiple destination locations. How does the AGENCY want the costs to be described, if not by cost per ton?

AGENCY expects to know the cost of transport from the Central Compost Site to each of the Agency approved compost facilities. It is expected that this would be in the form of cost per ton, though the PROPOSER may request a different metric if they choose. As described in the RFP and in this question, there are multiple sites to which the compostable material may be delivered, and the AGENCY expects to PROPOSER to detail those costs to each site. A simple cost per ton irrespective of the site would be very difficult for AGENCY to evaluate, and would cause concern about the quality of the PROPOSAL.

50. Will there be different procedures for transporting ground organic or compostable material during dry weather as opposed to wet weather? Which entity is responsible for ensuring each load is as dry as possible?

AGENCY does not contemplate a protocol for loading PROPOSER's vehicles which depends on the weather. At present, there are no requirements that the loads be kept as dry as possible prior to loading.

51. Where will the loads be weighed? It is assumed that the scale located at the Central Disposal Site will be used. Are there additional costs for use of the scale? Who will estimate the load weight during loading? Who is responsible for additional costs if the load capacity of the transport vehicle is exceeded and a portion of material must be removed?

The successful PROPOSER is responsible for ensuring its equipment operates within compliance of all applicable laws. However, PROPOSER is expected to collaborate with AGENCY to resolve issues which cause a significant hardship for PROPOSER.

52. Will compost amendment or augmentation material be transported?

No.

53. Has the LEA been notified of the potential change in operations? If so, has the LEA approved the potential change in operations?

AGENCY has discussed this scenario with the LEA. The LEA has not explicitly approved the potential change in operations, but understands the gravity of the situation should the changes be necessary.

54. We understand that the Central Compost Site is located on a landfill cell and active methane collection wells are also located within the Central Compost Site. Further, we understand that Sonoma County inspected the site on February 18, 2014 and found that all of the methane wells are not properly protected. Has this been corrected? If not, what are the precautions that must be met to operate transport vehicles around unprotected methane wells?

Sonoma Compost Company is in the process of installing additional protections around each methane well in their operational footprint. Should the AGENCY require PROPOSER's services, the methane wells around the collection and transport area would be prioritized and completed before the effective date of this agreement.

55. Is the PROPOSER responsible for ensuring all load meet odor restriction requirements?

PROPOSER is expected to be a collaborative partner in solving solutions which may arise during the term of this agreement. If PROPOSER is aware of, or becomes aware of, measures that can assist in the minimization of any nuisance condition that may arise during the term of this agreement, it is expected that PROPOSER would communicate this to AGENCY. PROPOSER is responsible for the minimization of odors as it relates to the transport of compostable materials, and is not responsible

for the minimization of odors prior to the loading of compostable materials into PROPOSER's transport vehicles.

56. Will a manifest be required for transport of the compostable or organic material? If so, who is responsible for preparing the manifest?

AGENCY expects to have a clear accounting of materials transported on AGENCY's behalf.

57. Is food waste considered to be contaminant to compostable or organic material? Can the material be mixed or must separate loads be transported?

Non-vegetative food waste is not permitted at the Central Compost Site, and is considered a contaminant. As such source-separated loads of non-vegetative food waste are not allowed and should not be routed to the Central Compost Site, if the PROPOSER has the ability to do so under separate agreements to which the AGENCY is not a party.

58. Is the required insurance in the RFP the same required insurance for the current operator of the Central Composting Site?

No.

59. If third-party personnel or the PROPOSER are required to load transport vehicles, are the insurance requirements as listed in the RFP?

Third party personnel shall be required to have a minimum of \$2,000,000 per occurrence of commercial/comprehensive general liability to load transport vehicles.

60. Is the AGENCY examining rail (railroad) as an option to transport the compostable or organic material?

AGENCY is interested in proposals which include rail haul as an option. However, the timeline for entering into this agreement has not allowed for an exhaustive search of compost facilities near rail spurs. If the PROPOSER wishes to include the use of a transfer facility with rail access, and the disposal at a compost facility with rail access, PROPOSER should include the details of the process in their proposal, including any required permitting.