



# Request for Information - Addendum

## Organic Waste Processing

**Issued:** October 10, 2016

**RFI Submission Deadline:** November 14, 2016 by 4:00 p.m. (PST)

Patrick Carter  
Executive Director, Sonoma County Waste Management Agency  
2300 County Center Dr., B-100, Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
(707) 565-3579  
[Patrick.Carter@sonoma-county.org](mailto:Patrick.Carter@sonoma-county.org)

## Sonoma County Waste Management Agency | Organic Waste Processing RFI Addendum

1. Has the County and or, the Waste Mngmt. Agency already identified and selected a central location/site for the composting facility?

Response: The Sonoma County Waste Management Agency (SCWMA) previously underwent a process to identify and examine the environmental impacts of potential composting sites throughout Sonoma County. The SCWMA selected a site, certified a Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and subsequently revoked the certification of the EIR and site selection. As such, the SCWMA has not selected and does not have a preference toward any site for establishing a new organics processing facility.

2. Would the County and or, the Waste Mngmt. Agency be open to having several smaller facilities around the county in order to streamline the transport of compostable material to a facility?

Response: Currently, the SCWMA pays for the transport and disposal of wood waste, green waste, and co-mingled residential food waste from County-owned transfer stations to four compost facilities. The direction of that flow is based upon factors including disposal costs, transport costs, and available capacity at the four compost sites. For the purposes of this RFI, the SCWMA envisions the materials currently handled by the SCWMA would continue to originate from the five County-owned transfer stations or be direct-hauled to the proposed facility. The SCWMA is open to the concept of multiple organics processing facilities at different locations, but ultimately the decision to commit flow will depend on the specific circumstances of potential organics processing site(s).

3. Is the County and or, the Waste Mngmt. Agency interested in expanding the type of organic feedstock to a facility that would include green waste, food waste and FOG for the purpose of generating sustainable RNG, biodiesel, compost/soil amendment, concentrate fertilizer and recycled water?

Response: The SCWMA is interested in the possibility of organic processing sites expanding the types and quantities of materials beyond those currently accepted, the additional diversion that may allow, and the potential for creating new marketable products from feedstocks that were previously landfilled or destroyed in another manner.

4. Present tipping Fees for the [Table 4].

Response: The current tipping fees for organic materials (Wood waste, source separated plant materials, and co-mingled plant materials and residential food waste) at the County-owned transfer stations throughout Sonoma County is \$72.06 per ton for self-hauled and unincorporated material, and \$76.16 per ton for incorporated city material, including SCWMA, County, and other fees.

5. For the other below I need the tipping fees for organic hazardous waste such as oil sludges.

## Sonoma County Waste Management Agency | Organic Waste Processing RFI Addendum

Response: The SCWMA encourages respondents to fully research existing disposal costs of all materials they are considering accepting.

6. There is a question per site location. Does this only refer to SCWMA or locations outside SCWMA territory?

Response: The SCWMA is not limiting responses to this RFI to locations within Sonoma County.

7. Part 3 Operational Information. Is the reply limited to the form or can it be an attachment?

Response: The SCWMA encourages respondents to provide all of the information requested in each form. Please refer to Section 4 of the RFI for submittal guidelines, including the treatment of attachments and the limitation of the response to 25 pages.

8. Part 4, Item 4.2: Can this question be clarified? Are there any taxes imposed on the acceptance of the material stream or output? By fees do you mean tipping fees for accepting the material stream?

Response: This refers to any taxes, fees, or surcharges which may be applicable tipping fees at an organics processing facility, including County Concession fees, SCWMA surcharge, LEA fees, host fees, etc. The intent behind this question is be able to perform an “apples to apples” comparison of tipping fees.

9. Form B. Is there only one location the receipt of the defined material stream and if not, how many different locations is presently processing the material stream, where and what volumes?

Response: Tables 1 and 2 show the current and potential organics diversion tonnages by origin location. The materials listed in both tables are currently delivered to the County-owned transfer stations within Sonoma County. Form B refers annual tonnage capacity and contamination thresholds and are to be filled out by the respondent, as it refers to the respondent’s proposed organics processing facility or facilities. The respondent may use multiple Forms B if multiple facilities are proposed.

10. I have read over the RFI and believe it is a bit over reaching. No business wants to share their information with everyone and it seems a bit pre-mature to lay out a plan for all to see.

Response: This comment is noted and understood by the SCWMA. However, securing the long term capacity of organics generated within Sonoma County is a very important and complex issue. We are asking for the most information possible to solve this issue, and encourage respondents to supply as much information through this process as feasible. The decision of whether to provide financial information, or how much detail that response includes, is a decision to be made by the respondent.

## Sonoma County Waste Management Agency | Organic Waste Processing RFI Addendum

11. 4.2 can you supply me some information on this?

Response: Please see response to question 8.

12. SCWMA are currently \$58/ton. What is the transport cost and what is material cost?

Response: As there are five County-owned transfer stations where the material currently originates, and four destination compost facilities, the breakdown of the transport and disposal fees varies. The current transport cost per ton ranges from \$7.42/ton to \$26.47/ton. Current disposal fees range from \$32/ton to \$44.50/ton.

13. We would not be able to supply transport for materials so that would be contracted out to designated hauler.

Response: Though the SCWMA would encourage the respondent to consider transport costs into the feasibility of the facility or facilities, for the purposes of this RFI, the SCWMA envisions the materials currently handled by the SCWMA would continue to originate from the five County-owned transfer stations or be direct-hauled to the proposed facility. Other materials not currently handled would be subject to delivery through existing city or county franchise agreements, non-exclusive franchise approved haulers, or self-hauled to the proposed facilities.

14. The below chart from the SCWA - RFI (Table 2) describes the recoverable tonnage of various wastes. Could you clarify if these are daily, weekly, monthly or, annual volumes? I could not find that definition in the RFI and this will be helpful to a proposal.

Response: Both Tables 1 and 2 have units of tons per year.

15. Will SCWMA be seeking one composting operation or multiple composting operations to ensure diversion?

Response: At this point, the SCWMA does not express a preference toward one organics processing operation or multiple facilities. The responses to this RFI and subsequent competitive processes may be used to determine the answer to that question.

16. Clarification on Table 2: Where did uncaptured numbers come from as they seem very low for Green Yard Waste?

Response: Uncaptured tonnages were derived from the SCWMA's 2014 Waste Characterization Study, which can be viewed at <http://www.recyclenow.org/agency/reports.asp>. Tonnages were prorated to match 2015 overall tonnages.

## Sonoma County Waste Management Agency | Organic Waste Processing RFI Addendum

17. Clarification on 1.6 (Page 10): Equivalent projects currently in operation. Please clarify required information as we currently had plans under consideration before the RFI was issued.

Response: The question refers to understanding the respondent's experience with currently permitted and operating facilities. It is impossible to evaluate the respondent's operating experience from a non-operational facility, therefore planned facilities should not be listed in this section.

18. Current contracts. Please clarify information required.

Response: As with the response to question 17, the purpose of requesting information about current contracts is to evaluate the respondent's experience operating a regional or subregional organics processing facility. For example, agreements to accept organics flow from material haulers or municipalities would be evidence of experience.

19. Clarification 2.1 Planned expansion to existing to meet RFI requirement? Or if we are expanding to fit business needs?

Response: A planned facility is a facility not yet operating. An existing facility would be a facility already operating and not requiring any expansion to accommodate the material flows described in the RFI. A planned expansion to existing facility would be a currently operating facility that cannot accommodate the material flows or types described in this RFI without a capacity expansion or major change to operations, potentially involving changes to the permitting status (amendment, modification, revision, new permit, etc.). It is not required to describe whether the planned expansion was already under consideration or is a result of this RFI.

20. Section 4.1: Will SCWMA and Member Agencies be offering financing options?

Response: At this point, the SCWMA is not considering offering financing. However, the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) does offer grants and loans for projects involving the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and market development for recycled products. Please visit <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/Funding/> for more details. Respondents are encouraged to explore the potential for other funding sources as well.

21. Clarification on 4.2: Can you supply more information on what SCWMA required from past contracts with other entities?

Response: This is a general RFI; specific contractual requirements will be available as part of the future RFP process. Additionally, the circumstances of this process are expected to be sufficiently different from past contracts, which lessens the utility of reusing provisions from past contracts.

## Sonoma County Waste Management Agency | Organic Waste Processing RFI Addendum

22. Form B Tonnage: [This company] may only be interested in certain types of materials (i.e. green yard debris). Is this RFI process open to this?

Response: Yes. Not all potential facilities are suitable to all materials, and the SCWMA recognizes that some facilities may be limited in the types or amounts of materials accepted. The purpose of Form B is for the SCWMA to understand those limits and plan for the material diversion accordingly.

23. Form C Cost: Baseline cost through the SCWMA currently \$58/ton. What is included in the \$58/ton

Response: Please see the response to question 12.

24. What is the transport cost?

Response: Transportation costs are dependent on a number of factors including, but not limited to site location, distance from material origin, and traffic. Transportation costs will need to be determined after site locations are known. For current transport costs, refer to the response to question 12.

25. What is the material processing cost?

Response: Material processing costs will need to be determined by the respondents. For current processing costs, refer to the response to question 12.

26. We would not be able to supply transport for materials so that would be contracted out to designated hauler. Would that be acceptable?

Response: Please see the response to question 13.

27. Would SCWMA want to be included in any contact negotiations for hauling?

Response: Please see the response to question 13. It is not currently envisioned that new negotiations for transport of the material would be needed by the respondent.

28. What is contract length if issued as Table 5 lists 5 and 10 year periods?

Response: The SCWMA encourages respondents to supply cost per ton for the material types listed for 5, 10 or other flow commitment periods. It would be expected that the contract lengths would match the flow commitment periods. The purpose of this information is to determine how the length of the potential agreement would affect the tipping fee cost.

## Sonoma County Waste Management Agency | Organic Waste Processing RFI Addendum

29. Are there avenues for rate increase in these periods of time?

Response: Assumptions regarding rate increases would be helpful for the SCWMA to evaluate, however, rates would be subject to negotiation in future competitive processes.

30. What are next steps after RFI review period Winter/Summer 2017?

Response: As described in the background of the RFI, the future authority over Sonoma County wood and green waste is uncertain beyond February 2018. It is envisioned that the evaluation of responses received from this RFI will continue concurrently with the work to determine the future authority and ability to make the long term material flow commitments necessary to secure long term organic material capacity. The SCWMA and its member agencies reserve the right to conduct future competitive processes, including Requests for Qualifications and Requests for Proposals to secure long term organics processing capacity.

31. What does the review process entail and who are the reviewers?

Response: As there are many potential outcomes for securing long term organics processing capacity, the reviewers, which may include SCWMA, County, City, and Consultant staff, will examine the responses submitted to determine the feasibility and likelihood of securing capacity with respondents.

32. Will all questions submitted by all parties be open for review?

Response: As described on page 7 of the RFI. All correspondence with the SCWMA, including responses to this RFI will become public records and are subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act. If respondents are claiming Confidentiality, Trade Secret, or Proprietary exemptions, please refer to page 7 of the RFI, under the heading of "Responses will Become Public Record."

33. Does SCWMA have outside technical support or engineer companies they are working with that can be leveraged by RFI submitters?

In the SCWMA's previous effort to site, design, permit, and operate a compost site, the SCWMA has worked with the following firms: ESA Associates, HDR, Inc., Integrated Waste Management Consulting, Tetra Tech Inc., and CH2M Hill, Inc. This list is supplied exclusively for information purposes; the SCWMA will not give any preference or special consideration to respondents which may or may not engage in contractual arrangement with these companies.

34. Will AB 876 be part of reporting requirement by contracted company?

## Sonoma County Waste Management Agency | Organic Waste Processing RFI Addendum

Response: The SCWMA is currently responsible for AB 876 reporting to CalRecycle. This RFI is the first step in addressing the questions asked by CalRecycle under the auspices of AB 876. Future reporting regarding capacity and capability to accepting organic material are subject to a future agreement involving the commitment of organic material flow.

35. What happen to this process in Feb 2018 if SCWMA is not funded?

Response: If at any point in the future, the SCWMA no longer has the authority to direct the flow of organic materials, it is assumed that responsibility would return to the Cities and County. The SCWMA believes the information received through responses to this RFI would be useful to those parties as well, and the SCWMA will cooperate with those parties in the transition. However, the County and the Cities reserve the right to perform independent procurement processes at their own discretion.

36. What is SCWMA and Member Agencies desired timeline to have a fully functional facility operational (within how many years)?

Response: There is no set timeline, but the SCWMA and member agencies wish to secure long term organics processing capacity as soon as is feasible. The SCWMA believes that capacity through existing facilities could be secured as soon as the issue of authority for flow of organic materials is settled between SCWMA member agencies, and that new facilities could be constructed in 6 months to five years, depending on how shovel-ready the project is.

37. Any planned workshops for RFI responders to ask questions and receive more information?

Response: No workshops are expected for this RFI. However, the SCWMA does reserve right to receive additional information, as described in the RFI, Section 5.

38. If the JPA is not renewed beyond 2018, Who will the actual contracts be with? The Individual Cities or will it be a combined contract between all ten member agencies?

Response: Please see the response to question 35. Additionally, it is possible, but unknown at this point, that two or more SCWMA members could perform joint procurement processes outside of the SCWMA to secure long term organics processing capacity.

39. Will the JPA or any of the member cities consider any financing of this project or is the goal to have the operator finance the project?

Response: Please see the response to question 20.

40. Will the SCWMA consider owning or operating the facility? Or Individual agencies?

Response: At this point, the SCWMA is not considering owning or operating the facility or property on which it is located. However, the respondents may wish to investigate whether



## Sonoma County Waste Management Agency | Organic Waste Processing RFI

### Addendum

there are potential synergies with co-locating facilities with existing, publicly owned treatment works.

41. Will the SCWMA embark on an education program to assist in the residential diversion and collection of foodwaste? This may include the distribution of small food waste containers for all residential units to collect foodwaste and co-mingle it was the yard waste.

Response: The SCWMA recognizes the contamination of wood, green, and food waste is currently a significant issue and may be exacerbated by program expansions. The SCWMA is committed to improving education related to reducing contamination and encouraging proper diversion practices.

42. Who will be responsible for unacceptable contamination that appears in the waste stream?

Response: Specific terms related to operating procedures are premature at this point, but the SCWMA would presume that operators would reserve the right to reject loads due to excessive contamination, among other potential solutions.

43. Table 1: Is self-haul included in the tonnage for each municipality. The total volume of organics seem low.

Response: Self-haul tonnage is included in Table 1. Please note that green waste collected by Petaluma's franchised hauler is not included in Table 1, as indicated by footnote 1 on Page 3 of the RFI. Petaluma's tonnage for 2015 was 10,331 tons. Including the Petaluma tonnage with the tonnage listed in Table 1 brings the grand total to 98,588 tons for 2015, which would have been an above average year, from a tonnage standpoint, for the SCWMA's organics program operations at the Central Disposal Site.

44. 4.2) Description of taxes or fees that might be applicable to the receipt of SCWMA's material stream: What is meant by these? SCWMA and County fees?

Response: Please see the response to question 8.

45. Table 4: Source-Separated Plant Materials (e.g. yard and green waste) - Does that include any food scraps? We understood that there is no clean self-haul material anymore, since it is all co-mingled with curbside organics that include food scraps. Or, is there consideration to keep self-haul separate?

Response: Source-separated plant materials would not contain food scraps, as food scraps often trigger different permit requirements that not all facilities currently accommodate. Though individual sites may have specific permitting requirements, the SCWMA does not intend to limit the amount or types of materials that might be accepted at a future compost facility.

46. If we do not participate in the RFI, will it exclude us from participating in the next steps of the bidding process?

Response: The responses received through this RFI will be used to determine the list of recipients for a future RFQ/RFP process led by the SCWMA. In the event that the SCWMA

## Sonoma County Waste Management Agency | Organic Waste Processing RFI Addendum

issues a RFQ/RFP, only respondents to this RFI will be eligible to submit responses to the RFQ/RFP. However, individual SCWMA members may choose to perform separate competitive processes, in which case, those members may or may not choose to use the results of this RFI process.

The SCWMA recognizes that some respondents may not wish to fully disclose information that will eventually become a public record. As this is the first step in a larger process to secure long term organics processing capacity and it is necessary to receive answers to the fundamental questions asked in this RFI process, respondents are encouraged to include as much of the requested information as possible. The SCWMA reserves the right to reject responses which, in the SCWMA's sole discretion, fail to provide sufficient information about the respondent's ability to provide long term organics processing capacity.

47. What method will SCWMA use to collect information in the organics recycling market areas of feedstocks, logistics, technologies, bioproducts, and capital?

Response: The SCWMA has performed waste characterization studies and uses County-owned transfer station records for materials disposed and hauled for processing, respectively. The SCWMA encourages further developing the market for finished compost and other organic material processing byproducts, though the SCWMA envisions the processing facilities would have a financial incentive to maximize the market for products they create.

48. How does the County identify all incoming sources of material independent of the RFI Process? What is the source of the data, how often is it updated, and what is the County's data management system that feeds into the plan?

Response: The County's Master Operating Agreement with Republic Services governs the County's identification of incoming material, and the information is updated by Republic Services on a continuing basis, and reported to the County on a monthly basis.

49. What systems are in place to capture this information in perpetuity that reflect the dynamic nature of these material flows?

Response: The question is beyond the scope of this RFI.

50. What is your method(s) for processing that information to develop integrated market analyses algorithms and reports to support the plan?

Response: The question is beyond the scope of this RFI.

51. What type of actual market information such as material input tipping fees, technology capital and operating costs, bioproduct prices, and market fluctuations is included?

## **Sonoma County Waste Management Agency | Organic Waste Processing RFI Addendum**

Response: The question is beyond the scope of this RFI. Respondents are responsible for determining their own tipping fees, technology, operating costs, and market for byproducts.

52. Which contractor does SCWMA currently (or usually) work with to assist in providing the solid waste management data gathering?

Response: Please see the response to questions 47 and 48.

53. What level of engagement does SCWMA have with the jurisdictions in the OMIP process (data, plan writing, and implementation)?

Response: The question is beyond the scope of this RFI.

54. How does the plan use the latest circular economic principles and processes? If it does not, what is it based on?

Response: The question is beyond the scope of this RFI.

55. Which contractor does SCWMA currently (usually) work with to assist in providing the solid waste management OMIP writing?

Response: The question is beyond the scope of this RFI

56. How will RFI submittal info be used to assist in creating the OMIP?

Response: The question is beyond the scope of this RFI.

57. How is the OMP used to implement organics recycling industry development in our jurisdiction?

Response: The question is beyond the scope of this RFI.

58. Which contractors do you use to help guide this process?

Response: The question is beyond the scope of this RFI.

59. Is there a separate process for the economic development of the entire organics (carbon and nitrogen) resource recycling industry?

Response: The question is beyond the scope of this RFI.

60. Considering SCWMA's compost contracts are expiring in Feb 2017 and the RFI is seeking, waste processing services that could be utilized "now or in the immediate future": Will proposals for the construction of new facilities, constructed for the purpose of handling this

## Sonoma County Waste Management Agency | Organic Waste Processing RFI

### Addendum

newly available tonnage, be considered? Assuming that the permit and construction process for a new composting facility in CA is a 1-2 year process? In other words, what is meant by “immediate,” and will new construction projects be considered or only existing facilities?

Response: Please see the response to question 36.

61. Also, would proposals be considered that require capital investment from SCWMA for the construction of a new facility or expansion of a current facility? Depending on the investment, benefits for SCWMA could include ownership of equipment, facility, percentage of tipping revenue, etc.

Response: Please see the response to questions 20 and 40.