

## Questions and Answers under the Request for Proposal for the Biomass Utilization Study

1. Is a fixed fee structure the only contract form you will consider? Can consultants bill at an hourly rate with a "not to exceed" cap? This would control the overall costs and ensure that all the objectives are still met.

Answer: This project has a total "not to exceed" cap and is, in that sense, "capped." The total project budget is \$285,000, and this "not to exceed" cap is expected to be the total in the table on p. 11 of the RFP submitted as part of your proposal. (The final contract for the project will include negotiated "not to exceed" caps for each of the Parts of the Study in this table.) The hourly rates included in the appendices should be looked at as examples used in the grant proposal that secured the award funding this study. Each proposal can submit the rates and hours that the team believes can complete the project competently and on time.

2. Is the \$100/hr rate on p. 37, Exhibit B-1 a placeholder, or is a required target rate for work on the project? Is this considered a ceiling?

Answer: This rate is a placeholder, not a ceiling. Please submit your proposal based on the rate structure for your team that will secure the talent needed to achieve objectives and complete deliverables. Keep in mind, of course, that proposals will be compared in part based on their budgets.

3. On page 37: "Project Manager and Study Consultant will be selected by RFP pursuant to RCD procedures. Therefore, their rates and hours are estimates at this time, and they will be adjusted to remain within State pay rates and the overall contract amount." Can you clarify "State pay rates?"

Answer: We want to compliment your reading into the appendices and its footnotes so closely. We will work with the selected Consultant to assure that the State's concerns are addressed. You are not asked to consider or speak to this detail in your proposal.

4. The EXHIBIT B-1: COST BY TASK WORKSHEET on p. 37 specifies total funds available for each task. The spreadsheet specifies total funds available for each task. Is this budget allocation by task mandatory? Are we not allowed to exceed the "Total Costs" in the spreadsheet on p. 37? Does that mean we are not allowed to go above those costs? What if those costs are not sufficient to successfully complete the SOW?

Answer: These budget allocations represent initial project planning and were developed as part of the proposal for grant awarded to MRCD by OPR. They subsequently became part of the contract between MRCD and OPR. That said, there is room for your proposal to recommend different budget allocations that still achieve the objectives of the Study. The exact budget allocations will be worked out as part of contract negotiations with the selected Consultant.

5. Are biosolids feedstocks purposefully left out of the RFP?

Answer: No, biosolids are not excluded. They can certainly be included. The RFP lists *examples* of biomass feedstocks. The team that carries out this study is asked to identify any relevant feedstocks in its analysis and recommendations for catalyzing development of a better biomass utilization ecosystem.

6. What types of feedstocks are expected to be included in "green cart organics?" For a number of sources of possible feedstocks, we will need to rely on available published information. Is that going to be acceptable?

Answer: Part of the project involves identifying existing (current) and anticipated (future) materials that will be collected in green carts from the jurisdictions in Marin County. It also includes estimation of biomass feedstocks flowing from the significant "self haul" green material movement in the County. We understand exact numbers are elusive or unobtainable. A good proposal will explain the range of feedstocks that will be included in the feedstock confirmation or, perhaps, an approach to establishing the range of feedstocks that will be used in the feedstock confirmation. It will also indicate the types and sources of data that will be pursued to provide a comprehensive and reliable estimate for biomass feedstocks. To the extent possible and potentially for the entire biomass feedstock confirmation, we encourage the consultant to draw on existing, reliable data sets. Please refer to the parties listed under Part A of Attachment A, p. 15 of the PDF Request for Proposals.

7. Please define biomass feedstocks by organic waste types for clarity. Will it be the same definitions used in SB 1383 for organic waste types? Some may only think that this is the woody biomass fraction, but does it also include green waste, food waste, compostable papers and manures?

Answer: The analysis of feedstocks used in this study should consider the types of organic materials defined in SB 1383 alongside woody and green biomass trimmed from landscapes. Please note that the biomass-shed under consideration here is not necessarily the same in nature and boundaries as those in SB 1383. For example, SB 1383 primarily focuses on municipal material streams. Biomass materials from some natural and working lands are also of interest to this study.

8. Biomass Utilization Pathways should start out recognizing current programs and entitled programs. Part B – No. 6 needs to be elevated to the first issue as to define the current infrastructure that is in place and that is entitled and being built.

Answer: This type of feedback is welcome in your proposal -- both in any prioritization of objectives that you wish to provide and in your order for completing the work. (We also agree and intend for the economic analysis to consider existing infrastructure in its assessment of potential opportunities and investments.)

9. For the \$500,000 grant, is there budget for the current operators to provide this critical information to the selected consultant?

Answer: It is expected that the consultant carrying out this work will choose sources of data for the biomass feedstock confirmation and for the utilization pathways confirmation. If current operators are viewed as a valuable source of information for these parts of the study, the consultant is encouraged to work with them to compile these data. There is no additional budget for this, and the cost of doing this work should be included in a submitted proposal.

10. Biomass Utilization Pathways in Part B mentions many potential pathways. The Study should ensure that the selected pathways are in compliance with Article 2 of the SB 1383 regulations on what type of technologies constitute organic waste diversion. Why isn't SB 1383 compliance even mentioned?

Answer: The pathways for biomass utilization are quite diverse, and Article 2 of SB 1383 indicates that "Beginning January 1, 2022, CalRecycle will accept applications for technologies or processes that applicants would like to be evaluated as a reduction in landfill disposal in compliance with SB 1383. Only technologies not listed in 14 CCR Section 18983.1(b) as recovery or 14 CCR Section 18983.1(a) as landfill disposal will be considered." This suggests that, other than landfilling, potential pathways are numerous and are not likely to be a limiting factor in pathway selection. That said, we agree that some pathways can or will be used to achieve compliance with SB 1383 and others may only become compliance pathways in the future. While SB 1383 compliance is not the sole focus of this study, compliance requirements are included in Part C, Item 9 (p. 17) and Part D, Item 7 (p. 18).

11. Is the accounting for transportation (movement, sales, etc.) of both organic feedstocks and finished bioproducts to and from adjacent counties explicitly part of this RFP. (Effectively, this is a question about the utility of a regional approach in this study.)

Answer: The Marin Biomass Project asks questions based in the Marin County context as a case study. It is not meant to treat Marin County as an island. If evaluating Marin County's feedstocks and disposition pathways in a regional context offers significant benefits, efficiencies, and opportunities, you are welcome to recommend a regional approach.

12. On page 15: PART A #6: "Consult plans of the parties listed under Item 6." Where is Item 6?

Answer: Good catch, and apologies. You found an error in our RFP. The reference should be the parties under Item 5 and the entities in the intro paragraph. This list includes "parties primarily responsible for generating, hauling, and processing the material (e.g., franchised material recovery operators, wildfire fuel reduction managers, public land managers, landscape workers, self-haulers)" and "Zero Waste Marin's 2018 Organics Generation and Capacity Analysis, the 2020 Marin Community Wildfire Prevention Plan, the Marin Climate Action Plan 2030, and other sources, including material recovery vendors and wildfire prevention operations such as Marin Wildfire Prevention Authority, Firesafe Marin, and PG&E." The intention here is to encourage attention to work that has already been done, to build on it, and to feed back to it in the practical ways in light of the time, budget, available data, et cetera.

13. Would biweekly meetings (virtual Zoom) throughout the project duration be acceptable for estimating engagement between the Study Consultant with the Biomass Project Manager? (This question refers to line on 7 of the RFP: “Throughout the Study, the Study Consultant must be available for regular communications and periodic meetings with the MRCD Biomass Project Manager.”)

Answer: Yes, wholly acceptable. The meetings will be paced along with the work performed. The goal is having the Study Consultant and Project Manager easily accessible to each other while also assuring that the meetings are a value add.

14. Page 7 includes this text: “For each Deliverable 1 through 4 in Exhibit A-1, the Study Consultant must be available to meet three times with the Steering Committee and once with the Marin Biomass Collaborative.” Does this mean we should plan for 4 Deliverables \* 3 meetings = 12 meetings? Can those meetings be virtual (Zoom)?

Answer: Thanks for doing that math. Yes, that’s what we mean — but we mean (3+1) meetings X 4 deliverables = 16 meetings. We anticipate that many of these meetings will be online or in hybrid format. It is hard to know whether and when in-person meetings will be safe and customary again. We will point out that \$5,000 of the \$285,000 total budget is for travel and material expenses, and part of this money can fund travel for any in-person meetings.

15. On page 15: PART A: “Biomass Feedstock Confirmation. Assess the amounts, types, and characterization of biomass feedstocks collected (or treated) in Marin, currently and projected, including woody biomass and green cart organics.” Could you provide a link to your green cart collection program?

Answer: This website maintained by Zero Waste Marin offers a good starting point for thinking about green cart composition: <https://zerowastemarin.org/residents/composting-info/courses/composting-in-marin/>.

16. On page 15: Can you please provide links to the Marin Wildfire Prevention Authority 2021-2030 Work Plan and the Marin Municipal Water District’s 3-Year Work Plan?

Answer: Here is the [2022-2023 MWPA Work Plan](#). Here is the [MMWD 3-year Work Plan](#).

17. What role should primary versus secondary data collection play in this project?

Answer: A proposal is welcome to recommend primary data collection as part of its completion of Parts A-D of the Study, within the scope of the budget schedule of deliverables. The RFP is largely predicated on the idea of building on and, possibly, incrementally improving existing data sets through the Study. A proposal may include some primary data collection as beneficial or necessary.

18. Should a project consider manure? What about water?

Answer: If you think that consideration of manure and/or water management makes sense and could be completed within the project budget, you are welcome to include either or both of them even though neither is explicitly called out in the Study design and deliverables.