

Organic Material Diversion Services RFP

Addendum #2

March 13, 2019

Responses to Proposer Questions

Table of Contents

Page 2. RFP Process and Evaluation

Page 5. Contract Terms, Business Structure, and Performance Bond

Page 10. Organic Material Tonnage and Pricing

Page 13. Organic Material Waste Stream and Diversion

Page 18. Permits and Engineering

RFP Process and Evaluation

Question 1. May we have a copy of the sign-in sheet for the Mandatory Proposer's Conference on January 29 for the Organic Material Diversion Services RFP?

Yes. It is posted online at <http://www.wmr.saccounty.net/Pages/Doing-Business-with-Us.aspx>

Question 2. Will the decision making criteria be the same across each organization? Will these criteria vary for the near-term and long-term services?

Generally yes, the criteria will be the same for all jurisdictions. However, please note that certain factors are specific to each jurisdiction. For example, the third bullet in the list of criteria in Section 5.3 of the RFP states: "*Related costs to JURISDICTIONS for preparing, processing, and delivering/transporting ORGANIC MATERIAL to PROPOSER.*" These costs presumably will be different for each jurisdiction.

All three jurisdictions will be represented on the Evaluation Committee. Proposers will be rated based on the proposal that best suits the needs of the jurisdictions collectively. The same criteria will be utilized for both near and long-term diversion services.

Question 3. Can the County/Cities provide a schedule of milestones for the project? (ie RFP review, proposer selection ,negotiation, food waste collection, operation)

The jurisdictions are not providing a schedule of milestones for evaluation of proposals at this time. Refer to Section 2.1 of the RFP, which states "*food waste is presumed to be added to the green waste collection system by January 1, 2022*". Refer to Sections 2.6.3.1. and 2.6.3.2. of the RFP for description of timeframes for near- and long-term services. Also refer to Attachment 2, "Long-Term and Tonnage Commitment Matrix," stating the requirement that proposer "*must include a start date*" for long-term proposals.

Question 4. Proposal length: Is it correct to assume that Proposer financial statements are not included in the 20 page limit? (i.e. financial statements of the most recent 3 years for each entity signing the agreement may use 6 or more pages). May Proposers include Appendices separate from the 20 page limit for inclusion of potential facility plans, (assuming that overall file size is less than 20 MB)?

Question 5. (The RFP) specifies a 20-page limit; however, it is not clear what is included in this limitation. Is this limitation meant to be a TOTAL maximum including the cover letter, Table of Contents, required forms, attachments, and exhibits; proposer contacts (3), references (3), audited financial statements, statement of financial qualifications, description of the DIVERSION SERVICES facility (4), End-product marketing plan (3), etc.?

This response is for Questions 4 and 5. The following proposal elements are not included in the 20 page maximum, but should be identified in the table of contents as "Attachments":

- Figures and drawings;
- The completed term and tonnage commitment matrices ;
- The completed contract default form;
- Clearly stated specific Exceptions to the sample contracts;
- Financial statements.

Question 6. The delivery of a detailed evaluation of current conditions and preparation of quality solutions takes significant time and effort. Will the County/Cities consider extending the RFP response deadline by 6 weeks?

Question 7. In 3.3 it states electronic submittal is due April 4, 2019, however in 1 and 3 it states April 18, 2019. Please clarify.

Question 8. Section 3 of the RFP notes that proposals are due by 3 PM on Thursday, April 18; however, Page 8, section 3.3 states that proposals are due on Thursday, April 4. Please clarify the due date.

Question 9. Due to the complexity of the desired proposal, is an extension of the final submission deadline of April 18th possible? I.e.: 2 to 4 weeks?

This response is for Questions 6 through 9. Please note Addendum #1 to this RFP, posted to the procurement website: <http://www.wmr.saccounty.net/Pages/Doing-Business-with-Us.aspx>

The proposal submittal deadline has been extended to 3:00 pm, Thursday, May 9, 2019.

Question 10. While it is clearly described what the evaluation criteria are, can you provide information how much each of the 12 listed criteria weighs as percentages?

The jurisdictions are not applying percentages to the criteria.

Question 11. "Diversion facility (3) owned or operated by the PROPOSER that is yet to be constructed". Please clarify what timeline is expected for this facility and what requirements are expected for this facility.

Refer to Section 2.1 of the RFP, which states "*food waste is presumed to be added to the green waste collection system by January 1, 2022*". Refer to Sections 2.6.3.1. and 2.6.3.2. of the RFP for description of timeframes for near- and long-term services. Also

refer to Attachment 2, "Long-Term and Tonnage Commitment Matrix," stating the requirement that proposer "*must include a start date*" for long-term proposals.

Question 12. Is there a preference for siting an in-county facility vs. out-of-county?

No.

Question 13. (...) is (there) appropriate space available at Kiefer Landfill to site our proposed facility and I am curious if getting potential site plans with boundary conditions and buildable land within the site is something that can be obtained.

The permitted boundaries of Kiefer Landfill are not available for locating a new facility at which diversion services could be provided in connection with this RFP.

Question 14. Will the County/Cities take into consideration life cycle costs analysis and innovation potentials when assessing different options? Can you define what Best Value means for the County and each City?

Proposals will be rated according to the criteria identified in Section 5.3 of the RFP.

Question 15. Are there any deductions of points for not offering a near term solution or vice versa?

No.

Question 16. Can you provide a weighted rating matrix of the listed qualification requirements?

No.

Contract Terms, Business Structure, Bond Financing

Question 17. Can you propose with exceptions?

Yes.

Question 18. Would the JURISDICTION consider a lease extension provision that could be exercised following the expiration of the Long-Term Services term?

The County will consider optional lease term extension language as part of its negotiations with selected proposers of final contract terms.

Question 19. What are the requirements, if any, for a Joint Venture response?

Joint ventures are welcome to provide proposals. Financial information for each proposing partner would be required as part of the submittal.

Question 20. Can Diversion Services be provided by a facility operated by the Successful Proposer, but owned by a third party?

Yes.

Question 21. If we want to use one of the government-controlled sites, will there be a charge for such use (e.g., an annual lease)? If so, what will this charge be?

Yes, the County anticipates being compensated for use of its facilities, particularly if the organic material diversion facility accepts material from customers other than DWMR. Any proposed payments in the form of rent, royalty, or some combination thereof must be included in the proposal and stated in the blank space provided on the Term and Tonnage Commitment Matrix.

Question 22. In what time frame are the JURISDICTIONS anticipating to negotiate and award the contract(s)?

Jurisdictions anticipate taking the negotiated contract(s) to their approving governing bodies before the end of December 2019.

Question 23. How flexible is the long-term start date? How close to the near term start date of July 1, 2020, does it have to be?

The long-term start date is flexible. The near-term start date must begin July 1, 2020 as the jurisdictions' existing green waste contracts end on June 30, 2020.

Question 24. Will there be consistency and reciprocity in the cancelation provisions across the Jurisdictions?

Yes. Cancellation will be similar to the County provisions. Business terms must be agreed to during contract negotiations. If a proposer has exceptions to terms in the sample contract, such exceptions must clearly be identified in the proposal.

Question 25. Will the successful proponents be included in negotiations that might happen between the County and both cities depending on which proposals they select?

The Cities and County will negotiate terms for any contracts between them that are in their best interests. As necessary, any potential private contractors will be included in those discussions at the Cities' and County's discretion.

Question 26. The Folsom contract has a maximum term of 1 year (Sec. 2) and says the Consultant will be compensated on a time-and-materials basis (Sec. 4). Neither of these provisions is applicable to the Diversion Services contemplated by the RFP, which are for multi-year periods at specified prices per ton. Will the City delete these requirements?

The contracts included in the RFP are samples. Final agreements will reflect the nature of the services being solicited in this RFP and agreed-upon terms, including timeframes. Exceptions to the sample contracts must be submitted in writing as part of the proposal.

Question 27. Will the City award multiple contracts based upon processing facilities and split collection zones?

Refer to Section 1 of the RFP, particularly the second paragraph.

Question 28. Will the City award multiple contracts based upon current collection zones going to a processing facility?

Refer to Section 1 of the RFP, particularly the second paragraph.

Question 29. Will the County/Cities consider contract term longer than 20 years?

Proposals should be for a maximum initial term of twenty years. Possible extension terms can be negotiated during contract negotiations with each jurisdiction.

Question 30. In Exhibit A, Non-Professional Services Agreement, Section A on Page 45 describes prevailing wages. If workers are under a Collective Bargaining Agreement, does that satisfy prevailing wage requirements?

Generally speaking, the wages determined by the California Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) will overrule a collective bargaining agreement. In California, most DIR determinations are made from the union's Collective Bargaining Agreements. The Exhibits to the RFP are sample agreements only. Prevailing Wage standards and applicability are available from DIR. Potential proposals may include projects that qualify as Public Works Projects, or do not qualify as Public Works Projects. It is the proposer's responsibility to consult DIR and make the prevailing wage determination and incorporate those variables into their proposal.

Question 31. Will the County award multiple contracts based upon processing facilities and split collection zones?

Refer to Section 1 and Section 2.1 of the RFP. It is likely there will be more than one contract awarded. Also refer to Section 5.3 of the RFP, specifically the criterion including the cost to the jurisdictions to transport organic material to the Diversion Services Facility.

Question 32. Will the County award multiple contracts based upon current collection zones going to a processing facility?

Refer to Section 1 and Section 2.1 of the RFP. It is likely there will be more than one contract awarded. Also refer to Section 5.3 of the RFP, specifically the criterion including the cost to the jurisdictions to transport organic material to the Diversion Services Facility.

Question 33. Section 4.3.3 states that annual CPI adjustment of maximum 3 % per annum is allowed. Does this mean that the proposed per ton fee will automatically raise by 3 % every year or does the incumbent have to apply for a rate increase on an annual basis?

The cost proposal figure (or per ton fee) shall be adjusted by an amount equal to the lesser of 3% of the previous year's cost proposal figure or 100% of the increase (or decrease) in the CPI value from the prior year. The maximum annual CPI adjustment (increase or decrease) from the previous year's cost proposal figure is 3%.

Question 34. Page 29, Article 27 A Termination: Please clarify the minimum tonnage penalty in case the contract is canceled by incumbent. I.e. \$ 50 per ton fee for 6 month after written cancelation. So if the facility would propose a 100,000 tons per year capacity and cancelation occurs this would mean 50,000 (6 month) times \$ 50.- = 2.5 MM USD?

The minimum tonnage amount is based on the County's minimum tonnage commitment and not the facility's proposed capacity. The early termination penalty shall be calculated using the County's annual minimum tonnage commitment divided in half and

then multiplied by \$50.00/ton. If the County commits to a minimum annual tonnage amount of 50,000 tons, then the early termination penalty paid by Contractor to County shall be: $(50,000 \text{ tons}/2) * \$50.00/\text{ton} = \$1,250,000.00$

Question 35. How much of the sample contracts in the RFP is negotiable?

Please refer to Section 4.1 of the RFP. Exceptions to the sample contracts must be submitted in writing as part of the proposal.

Question 36. The "Ownership of Work Product" is a concern for us. We would propose to build a facility using advanced anaerobic digestion technology to digest food and green waste into biogas and RNG. The technology is licensed from another party and the license agreement covers proprietary information that we are obligated to protect. On page 22 the RFP states, "*All technical data, evaluations, plans, specifications, reports, documents, or other work products developed by CONTRACTOR provided hereunder shall be the exclusive property of COUNTY and shall be delivered to COUNTY upon completion of the services authorized hereunder.*" Page 55 and 62 has similar language.

Please clarify in this situation exactly what information would the CONTRACTOR would be required to provide COUNTY and the other entities. Obviously, for us to violate our confidentiality agreement with our technology licensor would place in legal peril with our technology licensor and therefore eliminate us from bidding. [see p10]

This provision covers only technical data, evaluations, plans, specifications, reports, documents, and other materials that the contractor develops or prepares as required by the Agreement, or otherwise develops or prepares in order to provide the services covered by the agreement. In the scenario described above, the provision would be inapplicable because the information is not developed or prepared by the contractor, is not developed or prepared pursuant to agreement, and presumably would be afforded protections under trade secrets law and privacy laws.

Question 37. On page 22, the sample contract for the County of Sacramento states "Publication of the information directly derived from work performed or data obtained in connection with services rendered under this Agreement must first be approved in writing by COUNTY." Please be more specific as to what exactly must be approved in writing?

Information obtained or developed by the contractor as a result of providing the contracted services to the County cannot be published without the County's consent or utilized for purposes other than those described in the agreement. This would cover, for example, information provided by the County to enable contractor to perform the services.

All confidential or proprietary information contained in the proposal shall be marked as such.

Question 38. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

CONTRACTOR and CONTRACTOR'S officers and employees shall not have a financial interest, or acquire any financial interest, direct or indirect, in any business, property or source of income which could be financially affected by or otherwise conflict in any manner or degree with the performance of services required under this Agreement.

This is a statement of the conflict of interest provision in the County's sample agreement, not a question.

Question 39. The sample contracts prohibit assignment of contract without written permission. If the company holding the contract is sold, does that constitute assignment and require permission?

This provision does not preclude subrogation or assumption of contractor's obligations by operation of law. While the County's consent to the sale would not be required, the County would expect the contractor to immediately notify the County of this development, as it would have consequences constituting a "material change" under the County's insurance requirements.

Question 40. The term of the performance Bond should be no more than that of the provisions for cancelation. Please expand on the Performance Bond Requirements for 100% of contract value.

The value of the Performance Bond was set based on the anticipated time required to procure a replacement.

Question 41. When shall the CONTRACTOR secure the mentioned performance bond?

The contractor will need to secure the performance bond once contract negotiations are nearing completion but before the final agreement is executed.

Question 42. Section 3.6: It is understood that the performance bond requirement is linked to the 100 % of the value of the annual contract. The RFP states further that the bond has to be annually renewable. Does that mean that the agency will be responsible for the cost annual of this bond or does the proposer need to consider the annual cost over the term of the contract in his annual fee?

Proposer pays for the costs of renewing the bond annually.

Organic Material Tonnage and Pricing

Question 43. This RFP is intended for the processing of residentially collected organics. Since commercial organics collection is an open market to other haulers, is it correct to assume that no separate RFP for commercial organics processing is foreseeable and a processing facility under this RFP can solicit commercial organics from various sources/haulers?

No separate RFP will be issued for commercially generated organics. The jurisdictions do not collect commercial organics.

Question 44. Can the Proposer bring in Organic tons from other areas to a facility located within a County-owned site?

Refer to Section 4.8 of the RFP, particularly the second paragraph.

Question 45. Will other Cities currently not included in the RFP be permitted to enter into agreements with the Successful Proposer for delivery of feedstock? Will additional Cities be required to complete agreements with the County?

Generally, cities not participating in this RFP could choose to enter into agreements with the successful proposer at their discretion and without entering into agreements with the County. However, if the successful proposer locates a facility at a County facility identified in Section 2.2 of the RFP or on other property owned by the County then any proposed arrangement between the successful proposer and a non-participating city likely would be subject to the County-owned facility's permit requirements or other entitlement limitations, respectively. The participating jurisdictions' tonnage commitments would be given precedence.

Question 46. Can you confirm that this RFP for residentially-generated material only? Do you anticipate putting out a similar procurement process for commercially-generated material at a later date?

This RFP is for residentially generated organic material. No separate RFP will be issued for commercially generated organics. The jurisdictions do not collect commercial organics.

Question 47. Will there be minimum tonnage commitments from the Jurisdictions?

Question 48. Are the County/Cities committing feedstock tonnage to ensure viability of proposed innovative solutions?

Question 49. Will the JURISDICTION make any commitments for tonnage supply (put or pay arrangement), or will the only commitments anticipated be to accept tonnage by the successful proposer(s)?

This response is for Questions 47 through 49. Yes. Each jurisdiction will make minimum tonnage commitments based on the nature of the proposals received and an evaluation of each proposal's benefit to each jurisdiction.

Question 50. Should the cost matrices in Attachment 2 of the RFP include the cost of material transfer bundled with the material tip fee? If not, how should material transportation be factored into costs?

The rates presented in proposals shall include all costs for transport and processing of the organic material from the point of delivery to the contractor.

Question 51. At the pre-proposal meeting a statement was made that in all likelihood there will be more than one contract awarded for the organics processing RFP. Can you clarify if this means that the agency plans to award ONE short term and ONE long term contract or does that imply that the agency prefers to award more than one contract for either or both of the terms?

The jurisdictions do not have preconceived notions regarding the nature or number of contracts that will be awarded. Each jurisdiction's minimum tonnage commitments will be based on the nature of the proposals received and an evaluation of each proposal's benefit to each jurisdiction. No jurisdiction will necessarily award one near-term and one long-term contract although such an outcome also is possible. Refer to Section 1 of the RFP, particularly the second paragraph.

Question 52. Under the RFP as written, the CONTRACTOR will be obligated to finance, design, build, own, and operate the facility(s) and take considerable risk in doing so since (1) sufficient time must be allowed to pay off the facility and (2) the terms of the RFP allow termination of the contract by COUNTY (and others) virtually at will of the COUNTY, etc. What can be done by the three government entities to mitigate this risk for CONTRACTORS?

Proposers are welcome to make exceptions to the sample contracts provided as Exhibits to the RFP. Those exceptions must be clearly identified and included in the proposal. The jurisdictions offer term and tonnage commitments and are open to negotiating contract provisions with successful proposers.

Question 53. Can the Organic Material be priced separately for Green Waste and Food Waste?

The jurisdictions will accept separate proposals for green waste, food waste and greenwaste/food waste combined. At a minimum, contractor shall provide proposals for greenwaste/food waste combined.

Question 54. What are the current tip fees for the material?

\$30 per ton at Kiefer Landfill and \$48 per ton at North Area Recovery Station.

Question 55. Can the County provide their residential collection route area per day with approximate tonnages?

Residential green waste currently collected fluctuates seasonally and County collections operate 5 days per week. Monthly collections figures have been posted for reference at the procurement website: <http://www.wmr.saccounty.net/Pages/Doing-Business-with-Us.aspx>.

Question 56. What are current tipping fees at the transfer stations listed in the RFP for green wastes and food wastes?

\$48 per ton at North Area Recovery Station; the South Area Transfer station is currently not in operation.

Question 57. What are current typical hauling costs for green wastes (a range is acceptable) in the RFP- covered area?

Presuming that hauling means collection, the County currently spends approximately \$175 per ton, overhead included, hauling organic material. This RFP is not for residential organic material collection services. Presuming that hauling means transfer hauling, the County currently spends approximately \$30-\$35 per ton for hauling and processing green waste. The paid rate is not based on "per ton" specifically but the range of figures is accurate.

Organic Material Waste Stream

Question 58. Do the Jurisdictions have plans to adopt separate collection methods for Green and Food Waste? Please explain. If not, will they consider?

The jurisdictions have not selected a method on collecting food waste with certainty. However, refer to Section 2.1 of the RFP stating the jurisdictions anticipate co-collection of food waste and green waste. The jurisdictions will consider proposals for separate collection if the proposals serve the best interest of their residential customers.

Question 59. Can the Proposer bid on Food Waste only?

Yes. Also see the answer to the question immediately above.

Question 60. Regarding the food waste percentage of total feedstock: Do the County/Cities have targets and/or plans to achieve food waste content higher than 10% of the total residential feedstock?

No. The 10% was a conservative **estimate** on percentage of diverted food waste from the refuse cart. In CalRecycle's 2014 waste characterization study (<https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/>), 25.6% of Sacramento County Unincorporated residentially disposed waste is **estimated** to be food waste. It will be each jurisdiction's goal to divert as much organic material out of the refuse cart as feasible. At this time, the quantity of food waste that will be diverted is unknown and the jurisdictions can only provide estimates.

Question 61. Regarding feedstock contamination: Can the County/Cities elaborate on expectations on the fees and use/disposal of contamination removed from feedstock? (For example, contamination rates may be greater than 15% or 20% in the early years of food waste collection and create higher volumes of material for potential use/disposal at increased processing costs.)

Proposer's fees for contamination, if any, should be included in the additional space made available on the Matrices.

Question 62. Can the proposer bid to only process green waste/food waste (mix collection)?

Yes.

Question 63. How can we obtain as soon as possible the waste characterization study mentioned on page 4 of the RFP?

The County's Department of Waste Management and Recycling green waste study

was of a limited sample that focused on quantitative measurements of all contaminants by weight and did not sort or characterize different types of contaminants. Please refer to Section 2.4 in the RFP that highlights the study's outcome finding a 4% (by weight) average contamination rate. This result should be considered for informational purposes only and in no way provides a guarantee of organic material contamination rates.

Question 64. Does this waste characterization study include a breakdown of the types and characteristics of the contaminants?

No.

Question 65. Can the Proposer begin accepting and processing Food Waste immediately in the Near Term?

No, food waste cannot be accepted and processed immediately as the jurisdictions' customers are not separating food waste out of the refuse cart at this time. However, the jurisdictions are willing to consider collecting food waste before the SB 1383 anticipated regulatory effective date of January 1, 2022.

Question 66. Can you clarify which dates are tentative for the County and each City to start food waste collection?

The jurisdictions are willing to consider collecting food waste before the SB 1383 anticipated regulatory effective date of January 1, 2022.

Question 67. How will end products other than composting be qualified as Diversion? Please explain this process.

For waste measurement purposes, diversion is any combination of waste prevention (source reduction), recycling, reuse and composting activities that reduces waste disposed at CalRecycle-permitted landfills and transformation facilities. Diversion is achieved through the implementation of diversion programs. Beginning January 1, 2020, the use of green material used as ADC will not constitute diversion through recycling and will be considered disposal.

Question 68. Will the Jurisdictions commit to purchasing any end products such as compost?

Jurisdictions are willing to consider committing to purchasing end products, such as compost, soil amendments, and renewable gas.

Question 69. Under the potential procurement provisions of 1383, is the COUNTY anticipating soil amendments or renewable gas, or what proportion if both?

Yes. Refer to Section 4.9 of the RFP, particularly the second paragraph. The County has not yet determined its procurement obligations or goals pursuant to SB 1383 regulations.

Question 70. Land application of green material with greater than 0.5% contamination is not allowed per Title 14. Should the contamination rate for land application for green material be greater 0.5% and be enforced at a later date, will those tonnages still count as diversion?

CalRecycle determines allowable contamination rates for land application. All land application must meet CalRecycle's conditions per Title 14, Section 17852, subsection (a)(24.5) of the California Code of Regulations.

Question 71. Land application of co-collected residential green waste and food waste has greater than 0.5% contamination. Will that still count as diversion?

All land application must meet CalRecycle's conditions per Title 14, Section 17852, subsection (a)(24.5) of the California Code of Regulations. All land application meeting such conditions may count towards diversion.

Question 72. Diversion credit. We are not finding a Chapter 9.3 referenced on page 5 [California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 7, Chapter 9.3, section 18840 et seq.] Can you provide a correct reference?

Please refer to CalRecycle's SB 1383 draft regulations (specifically, proposed Article 2., Section 18983.1(b) of proposed chapter 12 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations), which list all facilities, operations, or activities to which organic material may be sent or used and constitute as a reduction of landfill disposal, thus providing the jurisdictions with diversion credit.

Question 73. Do resident of the City of Sacramento or City of Folsom have the option of extra yard waste collection? If so, are they allowed to store the yard waste in plastic bags?

The City of Sacramento provides weekly 96 gallon containerized collection of yard waste organics. Container collection is year round and all residents get one container as part of their basic service. Additional containers are available for yard waste at an additional cost.

In order to handle the fall leaf drop and winter pruning, the City of Sacramento performs "In the Street" collection starting approximately November 1st and continuing through approximately January 31st. Loose "in the street" collection is provided in addition to containerized collection. The City anticipates adding food waste to the containerized collection system but **not** to the loose "In the Street" collection.

The City of Folsom offers additional carts for yard waste collection at an additional cost.

None of the jurisdictions collect yard waste in plastic bags.

Question 74. Are the County/Cities open to review their independent collection services system so an optimal solution can be found with the proposed innovative solutions?

The Cities and County operate their own respective residential collection systems. This RFP is not for residential organic material collection services.

Question 75. The food waste share in Folsom (30%) expected to be double than in Sacramento County and City (15-16%). Please explain why this assumptions / projections are different?

Each jurisdiction, familiar with its own customer behaviors and waste stream characteristics, arrived at its own conclusions regarding food waste content potentially available for diversion by way of the currently-used green waste containers.

The City of Folsom figure for food waste is taken from the CalRecycle 2014 Waste Characterization. It is only an estimate. The green waste figure is an actual annual tonnage.

Question 76. Page 3, Section 2.1 of the RFP states that having a tipping location in the north (NARS) and south (Sacramento Recycling and Transfer Station) for residential solid waste provides efficiency to the collection service, which the city would like to maintain that for organics services. However, in the previous sentence the RFP indicates all the city's organics are currently delivered to one location, Elder Creek. Can you please clarify if the city's organics are currently tipped at multiple locations?

Currently, all the City of Sacramento's green waste is tipped at Elder Creek Transfer Station. The City of Folsom's green waste is tipped at Kiefer Landfill.

Question 77. Page 3, Section 2.1 of the RFP states that all SACRAMENTO green waste is currently delivered to the Elder Creek Transfer Station and is utilized for a combination of ADC, biomass fuel and land application. Can the city provide the location(s) where the green waste is currently going to be utilized for ADC, biomass and land application?

Markets and end uses for this material are dynamic and continue to change subsequent to the issuance of this RFP. The City is not divulging specific end locations for material beyond the general information already provided in the RFP. The City encourages proposers to develop their own solutions, end uses, material marketing, and partnerships for the contract period beginning July 1st, 2020.

Question 78. Can the City provide their residential collection route area per day with approximate tonnages?

As noted, the Cities and County operate their own respective residential collection systems. This RFP is not for residential organic material collection services, but for processing services. The City is not providing daily route area information for the RFP. Additional information concerning this RFP is posted on the procurement website: <http://www.wmr.saccounty.net/Pages/Doing-Business-with-Us.aspx>

Question 79. On Page 2 of the RFP a breakdown of waste collected annually is provided and range of annual values. Can we obtain monthly values for the three jurisdictions?

These values have been posted for reference at the procurement website: <http://www.wmr.saccounty.net/Pages/Doing-Business-with-Us.aspx>.

Question 80. Who is currently hauling the green and food wastes from the transfer stations listed in the RFP? Is it the government entities listed in the RFP or private entities? If private entities, please provide their contact information.

Refer to Section 2.1 of the RFP for information about current green waste management. Green waste is currently transferred from NARS by Southwick and Sons Trucking. Contact is Kevin Southwick. Southwick and Sons Trucking operated under a contract with Old Durham Wood.

Question 81. What form will the CONTRACTOR receive the green waste (e.g., will it be chipped to 3" minus)?

Refer to Section 2.6.2 of the RFP, which states: "*CONTRACTOR will accept ORGANIC MATERIAL in an "as is" condition from JURISDICTION at the time ORGANIC MATERIAL is delivered to CONTRACTOR'S Facility.*"

Permits and Engineering

Question 82. What will an anaerobic digestion facility be regulated as?

The jurisdictions do not regulate anaerobic digestion facilities (In-Vessel Digestion Facility). CalRecycle has a Tiered Regulatory Placement chart that can provide more information on how In-Vessel Digestion Facilities are regulated. The Tiered Regulatory Placement chart can be found at: <https://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LEA/Regs/Tiered/TierChart>.

Additionally, the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) is the primary contact for the regulation of solid waste handling, processing or disposal activities, including permitting requirements. To determine whether a permit is required for any proposed facility, each potential operator should contact the appropriate county LEA and work with them directly regarding the applicability of regulatory requirements. These local enforcement agencies are certified by CalRecycle. Visit the LEA Directory, where a search can be conducted by county, at: <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LEA/Directory/>.

Question 83. What permits will be required for a private facility and who will be responsible to obtain them?

The permits required will depend on the type and location of the facility proposed. Refer to Section 4.7 of the RFP, particularly the fourth paragraph. The proposer is responsible for obtaining all entitlements necessary to provide the proposed services.

Question 84. What permits will be required for a facility located on County-owned site and who will be responsible to obtain them?

The permits required will depend on the type of the facility proposed. Refer to Section 4.7 of the RFP, particularly the fourth paragraph. The proposer is responsible for obtaining all entitlements necessary to provide the proposed services. The current permits for County-owned facilities are available on the procurement website: <http://www.wmr.saccounty.net/Pages/Doing-Business-with-Us.aspx>

Question 85. What will determine if a Solid Waste Permit is necessary for the facility and who will be responsible to obtain them? Please explain this process.

The permits required will depend on the type and location of the facility proposed. Refer to Section 4.7 of the RFP, particularly the fourth paragraph. The proposer is responsible for obtaining all entitlements necessary to provide the proposed services.

Question 86. Can we obtain an electronic copy (in AutoCAD format) of the site map for the South Area Transfer Station?

An AutoCAD drawing of the SATS Facility has been posted for reference at the procurement website: <http://www.wmr.saccounty.net/Pages/Doing-Business-with-Us.aspx>.

Question 87. Can we obtain a soils report and any other geotechnical data describing the subsurface conditions at the South Area Transfer Station site?

No geotechnical data for the SATS facility is known to be extant.

Question 88. Is there sanitary sewer for discharge at the SATS, and where is the stormwater discharge point?

Yes. Its location is identified on the AutoCAD drawing posted on the procurement website: <http://www.wmr.saccounty.net/Pages/Doing-Business-with-Us.aspx>.

Question 89. What is the existing power demand and power capacity at the SATS?

Single Line Electrical Diagram from 2013 has been posted for reference at the procurement website: <http://www.wmr.saccounty.net/Pages/Doing-Business-with-Us.aspx>.

Question 90. Is the County open to a contractor regrading and/or make alterations to portions of the SATS? Are there portions of the SATS that the County would prefer to be untouched (i.e., the transfer tunnel)?

The County is willing to consider significant alterations to the SATS facility.

Question 91. Regarding NARS master planning study: Does the County anticipate the Successful Proposer to incorporate master planning recommendations into their planned Diversion Facility?

No. the County does not anticipate the successful Proposer to incorporate master planning recommendations into their planned Diversion Facility.

Question 92. Are there any restrictions on siting an Organics Diversion Service facility for SATS, or NARS, or others? If so, please explain.

Refer to Section of 2.5 of the RFP, which states: "*The JURISDICTIONS are requiring that the successful PROPOSER(S) obtain all required permits....*" Also refer to Section 4.7 of the RFP, particularly the fourth paragraph.

Question 93. How much of the 23-acre NARS facility is available for the diversion services / facility?

The NARS site does not currently have any specific area designated as available for organics diversion services.

Question 94. Permitting status for SATS; what permits are active, and for how long? What permits are suspended?

The SATS Facility has an active SWFP.

Question 95. Can the proposer bid to have facilities at both the NARS and SATS locations?

Yes.

Question 96. Page 4, Section 2.2.1 of the RFP states the County is currently conducting a master planning study to support improvements at NARS. Can the County provide timing to the estimated completion of the master study and/or development of the mentioned improvements?

The NARS Master Plan study is presently in process and will be completed before the successful proposer(s) is selected.

Question 97. Is SATS currently permitted to accept food waste (including commercially-generated food waste)? Are there any operating restrictions? What improvements would be needed to the facility to start transferring material? Does the County have a plan or timeline for these improvements?

The SATS facility has a SWFP to transfer Municipal Solid Waste, which would cover food waste.

Question 98. Would the County consider using Kiefer Landfill as a transfer point for material?

The Solid Waste Facility Permit for Kiefer Landfill does not currently include large scale transfer operations.

Question 99. Page 14, Section 5.3, in the last bullet the RFP states the proposers will be rated on their proposal's impact to current County Solid Waste Facilities Permits (SWFP). Can the County clarify what is meant by the term "impact?" Does the County prefer these proposals not require or suggest any changes to the current SWFPs?

Any proposal that requires significant changes to the current SWFPs will need to be evaluated as to the potential financial, political, and temporal feasibility. Proposals that

do not appear to be viable will be rated poorly. Changes to the SWFP would need to be considered based upon significance.

Question 100. Section 2.3 of the RFP it is stated that alternatives sites to the NARS and SATS site will be considered. It also states that SWA previously had evaluated composting sites and an EIR was prepared for said sites. Are there any detailed site plans available for these sites for consideration of locating the proposed organics processing facility?

Information is available in the GreenCycle EIR. Refer to Section 2.3 of the RFP for instructions on how to find the information.

Question 101. According to Page 2 of the RFP, Figure 1 "...depicts the North and South collections areas and the location of the COUNTY facilities which might be used to handle organic material." We fail to see the locations of the County facilities in Figure 1 that are referred to in this statement. What are we missing?

The figure appears to be missing the County Facility locations. NARS is located at 4450 Roseville Road, North Highlands, CA 95660. SATS is located at 8550 Fruitridge Road, Sacramento, CA 95826.

Question 102. Just confirming that the clear span building and/or the footprint it's located on is dedicated to the existing tenant onsite.

The three-sided metal structure located south of the fueling station is not dedicated to the existing tenant. The tent structure located on the east side of the property is located on and dedicated to the use of the existing tenant.