

# ADDENDUM No. 1

RFP No. 936

## BIODIGESTER FEASIBILITY STUDY

**Due: September 21, 2015 at 10:00 A.M.**

The following changes, additions, and/or deletions shall be made to the Request for Proposal for Biodigester Feasibility Study RFP No. 936 on which proposals will be received on/or before September 21, 2015 by 10:00 P.M.

The information contained herein shall take precedence over the original documents and all previous addenda (if any), and is appended thereto. **This Addendum includes 4 page(s).**

**Offeror is to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 1, including all attachments in its Proposal by so indicating in the proposal that the addendum has been received. Proposals submitted without acknowledgement of receipt of this addendum will be considered nonconforming.**

### I. CORRECTIONS/ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

Changes to the Bid documents which are outlined below are referenced to a page or Section in which they appear conspicuously. The Bidder is to take note in its review of the documents and include these changes as they may affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

<u>Section/Page(s)</u>	<u>Change</u>
------------------------	---------------

Cover Page	As provided in RFP Document: BIODIGESTER FEASABILITY STUDY
	As updated herein: BIODIGESTER FEASIBILITY STUDY

*Comment: This change is intended to simply correct the typographical mistake in the RFP title.*

Page 15	As provided in RFP Document: Proposal Evaluation 1 - The selection committee will evaluate each proposal by the above-described criteria and point system (A through C, based on 85 points) to select a shortlist of firms for further consideration.
	As updated herein: Proposal Evaluation 1 - The selection committee will evaluate each proposal by the above-described criteria and point system (A through B, based on 90 points) to select a shortlist of firms for further consideration.

As provided in RFP Document

Proposal Evaluation 4 - The firms interviewed will then be re-evaluated by the above criteria (A through D), and adjustments to scoring will be made as appropriate.

As updated herein:

Proposal Evaluation 4 - The firms interviewed will then be re-evaluated by the above criteria (A through C), and adjustments to scoring will be made as appropriate.

*Comment: Initial evaluations will be based on Professional Qualifications/Quality of Work (70 points) and Proposed Work Plan (20 points).*

## II. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following Questions have been received by the City. Responses are being provided in accordance with the terms of the RFP. Respondents are directed to take note in its review of the documents of the following questions and City responses as they affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

Question 1: I would like to know if your objective is to generate only the gas or electricity as well from the bio-digester. We would be interested to participate if your goal would be to generate electricity.

Answer 1: Generation of electricity is one aspect of what is requested in the RFP Document.

Question 2: We've been talking to a number of different companies as we seek to find the right teaming relationship. A consistent question from all entities is the expected scope of the project. Can you offer any insight into the level-of-effort you expect for this project?

Answer 2: See Question/Answer 10.

Question 3: In Task 2, INPUTS: The solicitation refers to a "range" of organic materials. By "range", do you mean geographic, quality, quantity (or all 3)?

Answer 3: By range we mean the different types of organic materials (e.g., food waste, biosolids, FOG). Within that range there may be available organic material that may not be suitable for biodigestion. We are looking for the contractor to define the materials that are available for biodigestion within the three scales provided in the RFP. If the material is available but of insufficient quality and should not be included in the available material, the consultant should not do that as part of the analysis. If the material is available but should not be used in a biodigester (e.g., grass clippings, PLA plastic utensils), the contractor should also note that in the analysis.

Question 4: In Task 2, INPUTS, Bullet point 2 (Commercial Organics); what level of detail are you seeking for this item? The solicitation refers to quantity and quality of each source's biomass suitability. For example, the word "quality" can be connoted in a number of ways when describing organic materials.

Answer 4: We are looking to identify an estimate of how much of the material is available (and how certain you are of the estimate) and whether we should include this

material as part of the biodegradation stream for this analysis. If it is included in the analysis, we are interested in the amount of energy that will be produced for the material.

Question 5: Task 2 – Inputs: Biomass Estimates (with associated levels of risk or uncertainty); can you provide clarification on how this is denoted? (i.e. Percentage, or risky/not risky?)”

Answer 5: We are interested in estimates of weight and volume of material. We expect the contractor to provide any additional input as to “risk” associated with any one stream of organic material.

Question 6: In Task 2, INPUTS, Bullet point 3 (Sources outside Ann Arbor); is the 50 mile range only for biosolids outside Ann Arbor, or does this bullet ask for an evaluation of biosolids AND all other commercial organics within 50 miles.

Answer 6: All organics that we might want to pursue within 50 miles

Question 7: If the latter, is there a threshold on the size of the commercial source that you have in mind? (As we know from the previous Study, there is a very large number of “mom ‘n’ pop” sized sources that produce small amounts of organics.)

Answer 7: Whatever information we can gather in a reasonable level of effort given the scope of this project.

Question 8: In Task 3, DESIGN: The Task description states “All design, build, operation, and maintenance expenses will be clearly defined based on the input scenarios ... and any pre- or post-treatment needs to generate output material of sufficient quality”. What is the ‘quality’ metric you are seeking? Class A/B biosolids, or other?

Answer 8: We expect the contractor to make a recommendation on the quality of the material – or provide a cost benefit as to the cost to generate Class A vs. Class B

Question 9: In the Section “PROPOSAL EVALUATION”, the solicitation states that the selection committee will use a point system with items A through C, based on 85 points. However, in the PROPOSAL FORMAT section, A=70 points, B = 20 points and C= 10 points, for a total of 100 points. Can you clarify the discrepancy in the two totals? We are especially interested if the initial evaluation uses the Fee Proposal in the point total. Further, Item 4 on page 15 indicates that a re-evaluation will take place using Criteria A, B, C and D. However, D is the Authorized Negotiator and has no points assigned. Can you clarify?

Answer 9: See I. CORRECTIONS/ADDITIONS/DELETIONS within this Addendum #1 for corrections to this section.

Question 10: We would like a sense of the scope of the funding. We located a line item in the Ann Arbor 2016 budget for Biodigester Alternatives and Partners Study (MF-SW-16-01) for \$60k. Is this the correct line item for this project (and therefore the allotted budget)? If not, what is the expected budget?

Answer 10: \$60k is the expected budget for this study.

Question 11: We note that WEFtec is scheduled in Chicago on the 28th of September, which is also the estimated date for interviews. Given that most folks in the wastewater industry will be attending that conference, would you consider a change of date?

Answer 11: Yes, if we choose to interview, and the bidder has a conflict, we will consider making alternative arrangements.

Question 12: How much do you have budgeted for this project?

Answer 12: See Question/Answer 10.

Question: 13 Who will be the internal project team for the City on this project?

Answer 13: Matthew Naud, Nate Geisler, Christina Gomes and Keith Sanders.

Question 14: What is the expected timeline for project execution after the feasibility study is complete?

Answer 14: We expect that to be proposed by the contractor.

Question 15: Is this study being developed as part of a larger regional study (i.e. Washtenaw County or larger)?

Answer 15: For the biodigester work we are exploring this at three scales including an area within 50 miles of the city.

Question 16: What regional resources are being used to support this project (funding for the study, advisory committee, stakeholders, feedstock, markets, etc.)?

Question 16: This is funded by the city. We anticipate including county staff as part of the advisory group.

Respondents are responsible for any conclusions that they may draw from the information contained in the Addendum