

<b>Exhibit A</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>
1A.	There seems to be some inconsistencies between the waste flow data included in the "2006 Tons by Source by Site" report included in the RFQ attachments, and the data in RFQ Part A Section 2.1.2 as it relates to 2006 tpd calculations. Please provide additional back-up that shows how the tons per day calculations set forth in RFQ Section 2.1.2 are intended to tie out the figures in the "2006 Tons by Source by Site." For instance, does the data in Section 2.1.2 relate only to self-haul and commercial waste (excluding organics)? What were the number of days used by the County in arriving at the tons/day figures in Section 2.1.2?	The data in RFQ <u>Part A Section 2.1.2</u> for each facility are general estimates for self-haul and commercial waste, excluding organics. Actual data for 2006 is approximately 22 tpd for the Annapolis site, based on 256 operating days and includes waste delivered from the south coast area of Mendocino County. Actual data for 2006 for the other Transfer Stations is based on 359 operating days per year and calculates to be approximately 67 tpd for Guerneville; approximately 208 tpd for Healdsburg; approximately 242 tpd for Sonoma; and approximately 315 tpd for Central.
1B.	Are self-haulers operating in the unincorporated areas of the County required to use the County system for the disposition of waste in the same way that the licensed contract haulers are (in other words, is the self-hauled waste subject to flow control)?	There is no flow control for self-haulers.
2.	Since none of the cities in the County have flow control agreements to use the County waste disposal system, we assume that self-hauled waste originating in the various incorporated cities are not required to use the County system for waste disposal, however, please confirm.	Your assumption is correct; however, in practice, the County believes that a significant majority are using the County system. The County facilities are, in most cases, the most proximate for self-haulers.
3.	The last paragraph of RFQ Part A Section 2.1.2 indicates that the County is allowing approximately 200 tpd of "County-generated waste" to be direct-hauled to the Redwood Landfill. (a) To clarify, is this waste that emanates from the unincorporated areas of the County that would otherwise be flow-controlled to the County system in the absence of this "out-haul" contract? Other than the County, who is the other party (or parties) to this	(a) The 200 tons per day include some waste that would normally be flow controlled to the County system from unincorporated County license areas south of Highway 12, but it also includes waste from the cities of Sebastopol and Cotati who currently choose to use the County's system. (b) The direct-haul areas are described in the Agreement for

	<p>agreement?</p> <p>(b) the "2006 Tons by Source by Site" report reflects 62,774 tons of County-generated waste flowing through the County disposal system in 2006 (31,223 of which is self-haul waste) and another 25,123 of organics. We assume these 2006 figures exclude the 200 tpd that is currently by-passing the County system, however, please confirm or clarify?</p> <p>(c) The last sentence of RFQ Section 2.1.2 indicates that <i>"It is <u>not</u> anticipated that the current direct haul of this waste will <u>not</u> continue beyond the termination of the existing interim outhaul agreement, which expires in August 2010"</i> (<b>emphasis added</b>). Unless there is a typo in this sentence, we interpret this to mean that we should not count on this tonnage being redirected back to the County system via flow control after August 2010. Please clarify.</p>	<p>Transport and Disposal of Solid Waste (Agreement) as the unincorporated territories south of Highway 12 and the Cities of Cotati and Sebastopol.</p> <p>The Agreement is between U.S.A. Waste, Inc.; Redwood Landfill, Inc.; and the County. There are currently proposed amendments that would remove all requirements for U.S.A. Waste to direct haul waste to Redwood Landfill as a result of the purchase of WMI's territories by North Bay Corporation (aka West Sonoma County Disposal or WSCD). Those provisions are incorporated in the WSCD contract amendment. Both agreements with amendments will be made available in the data room.</p> <p>The "2006 Tons by Source by Site" data does not include the 200 tpd that is currently being direct hauled to Redwood Landfill.</p> <p>(c) RFQ <u>Part A, Section 2.1.2</u> contains a typo that has been corrected. See Addendum #1.</p>
4.	<p>Is all of the wood/organics material referenced in the "2006 Tons by Source by Site" report currently being diverted and how is it being diverted (i.e., being processed and/or composted on site, transferred to another location (i.e., Central LF composting site), what are the end uses)? Please provide this information as it relates to each transfer station site, as well as an indication as to who is providing the processing of this material and if these services are being provided under long-term agreements between the County and 3rd party processors that will remain in place under a proposed divestiture.</p>	<p>All wood and yard debris collected at the five Transfer Stations is transferred to the processing facility at Central Landfill. Wood waste is ground and shipped for fuel, or used for mulch and green waste is processed in to compost. The relevant agreement is the Sonoma Compost Company Agreement, which is available in the data room. Please also see Sections 5, 11, and 17 of the Joint Powers Agreement dated 2-11-1992, which is available in the data room.</p>
5.	<p>Please provide a breakdown of outgoing tonnage by disposal site for each transfer station that coincides</p>	<p>See chart "2006 Out-Haul Tonnage Summary by Site by</p>

	with the 2006 waste flow data, along with any changes to the distribution by site that may have occurred in 2007.	Destination Landfill”, which will be made available in the data room. The County has not requested any changes to distribution by site in 2007. Distribution is specified in the out-haul agreement with WSCD.
6.	In reference to the "2006 Tons by Source by Site" report included in the RFQ attachments, what are the designations of Central 1, 7, and 9 intended to represent?	The data is tracked by cashier computer station which corresponds to Central 1, 7 and 9. There are three cashier computer stations at the Central Transfer Station and one at each of the other four Transfer Stations.
7.	In terms of waste flow that is direct-hauled to the various County disposal sites, how would the 2006 waste flow data included in the "2006 Tons by Source by Site" report differ if the Central Landfill had remained open? In other words, would the tonnage amounts reflected as being direct-hauled to the Central Transfer Station currently be any different if the Central Transfer Station were closed and the landfill reopened and, if so, what would be the approximate redistribution of tonnage direct hauled to each site?	The distribution of tonnage between the various Transfer Stations would not be much different. Sonoma Transfer Station might be less and the Central Transfer Station might be more if the landfill were still open. Also, when the landfill was open, any commercial vehicles that came directly to the Central Transfer Station, drove right onto the fill area to dump, rather than dumping in the Tipping Building which was used for self-haul customers only.
8.	In view of some of the questions posed above regarding current tonnage flow, please provide more detail as to the actual tonnage commitments (or a range thereof) that could be expected under Scenarios 1(a), 1(b) and 4 of RFQ Part B Section 2.4, by site, and broken down by material type.  Also, with respect to 1(b), is the County referring to those cities that are currently disposing of waste at the <i>Central Transfer Station</i> , or is the County referring to those cities that are currently using the County disposal system in general (all transfer stations, including the Central Transfer Station)?	To respond to the scenarios described in <u>Part B, Section 2.4</u> , Proposers should consider utilizing historical tonnage figures, reviewing the BVA report and current tonnage amounts being out-hauled, looking at Transfer Station tonnages and estimating future amounts. See additional information on this topic, which has been added to the data room.  With respect to Scenario 1(b), the County is referring to the County disposal system in general and all sites including the Central Transfer Station.
		(i and ii) Any soils and rock

9.	<p>The county states that the landfill excavation includes rock and soil:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Please provide rock and soil characteristics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Soil analysis and classification.</li> <li>ii. Rock analysis and classification</li> <li>iii. How much soil has been sold off site each year over the last five years?</li> <li>iv. What are the permit conditions governing off site sale of rock?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>information available for areas not yet excavated in the West Expansion area is in the West Canyon Siting and Classification Study available in the data room.</p> <p>(iii) No soil has been sold off-site excluding soil amendment products.</p> <p>(iv) There currently are none, because the only permitted rock sales were in the area known as the rock extraction area, which is mined out. The EIR for the Landfill 2 expansion prohibited hauling rock out for sale. The West Expansion has no permit conditions associated with it, because neither CEQA nor resource agency permitting have been completed.</p>
10.	<p>What is the current soil balance for the current site and east canyon expansion?</p>	<p>The site has approximately 590,000 cubic yards of stockpiled soils. There is no current soil balance calculation for operation of the remaining permitted capacity.</p>
11.	<p>What is the anticipated soil balance for the west canyon expansion? (how is it planned to handle 19-million cy of soil and rock?)</p>	<p>Refer to the West Expansion Area Development Plan in the data room.</p>
12.	<p>Has any of the landfill received certified closure?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) If yes how many acres?</li> <li>(b) When is the next closure activities scheduled and what is the scope the that activity?</li> <li>(c) Would change in ownership effect any closure status of planned closure activity?</li> </ul>	<p>The landfill has not commenced closure activities, so no closure certification has been issued for any portion of the landfill. A preliminary closure plan was submitted in December 2004 and preliminary closure and post-closure maintenance plans were submitted in February 2005. No final plans have been submitted at this time. The County and the LEA/CIWMB are currently negotiating a Stipulated Notice and Order for future submittal of final closure and post-closure documentation.</p>

		Under the potential stipulated Notice & Order, a change in ownership may postpone obligations to commence closure activities should the new operator resume landfilling operations.
13.	What is the current closure and post closure cost estimate?	Refer to Annual Inflation Factor 2006 in the data room under Financial documents
14.	What is the current closure and post closure financial assurance mechanism and what is the status of its funding?	Refer to Pledge of Revenue in the data room under financial documents. Additional information will be added to the data room.
15.	What are the current and future mitigation obligations for the wetland/CTS habitat?	Current obligations are to maintain the created wetland and red-legged frog habitat on the Hammel property. The West Expansion has no mitigation obligations associated with it, because neither CEQA nor resource agency permitting have been completed.
16.	What is the current landfill cell development cost?	The County has not built any liner since 2004 and that liner system is no longer approved for future cell development by the RWQCB. Therefore, information concerning this system is not applicable.
17.	What is the anticipated landfill development cost for the west canyon expansion?	As set forth in the January 2004 West Canyon Development Plan, posted in the data room, the estimated development cost is approximately \$22,600,000.
18.	What is the status of the Landfill Closure Plan?	See answer to Question # 12
19.	What is the status of the Post Closure Care Plan?	See answer to Question # 12
20.	The RFQ states in Section A-2.4.3 that there are 22.8 acres of the Central landfill that haven't been constructed. How do the environmental issues related to the area called "Landfill 1" that is part of the Central landfill that resulted in the no acceptance of more	The 22.8 acres are within Phases III, IV and V of Landfill 2. The current WDRs, which were adopted as a result of the environmental issues associated

	<p>waste in the Central landfill, affect the commercial use of these 22.8 acres? Is it expected that the County will construct anything in this area in the near future? Are there any potential effects of the Landfill 1 environmental issues on the West Canyon expansion area?</p>	<p>with Phases I and II of Landfill 2, do not allow for disposal of waste in Landfill 2, Phases III, IV and V. Based on discussions to date with the Regional Board, the County understands that a future owner/operator will need to submit a revised engineered alternative design for a liner to the Regional Board and receive approval for such engineered alternative design to resume development of the 22.8 acres. This is an issue that will be addressed in detail in the industry review and RFP phase and shortlisted proposers will be encouraged to provide input on this topic.</p> <p>The Regional Board has verbally indicated to County staff that the limitation in the current WDR with respect to Landfill 1 and 2 should have no impact on the West Canyon Expansion as it is physically separated from Landfill 1 and 2.</p>
21.	<p>Section a-2.1.1, page A-6, states that there are two other properties included in the Central Landfill (Hammel road property and the protected area). How do these properties affect the Central landfill or the expansion area developments regarding to setbacks, restrictions, etc?</p>	<p>The referenced RFQ section discusses only one additional property known as the Hammel Rd. property, which is the location of the wetlands and red legged frog habitats. It is not anticipated that this property has any setbacks or restrictions to it that will impact future expansion of the West Expansion Area or use of the remaining areas of Landfill 1 and 2 and the property may be beneficial for such uses as a mitigation area.</p>
22.	<p>Section 3.2, on page A-15, explains that the county has “the right to undertake the divestiture through a long-term lease or easement”. It’s not clear when this can take place, or the way how the county can do this, or if some or all the assets can be included. They need to clarify the details of this point.</p>	<p>As noted in the referenced section, the County currently anticipates divestiture of the Assets through an outright sale under a purchase and sale agreement. However, the County also recognizes that other structures, such as entering into long-term leases or easements,</p>

		<p>may also work to achieve its goals and wants to retain that flexibility during the RFQ phase. Through its review of the SOQs and the industry review phase following shortlisting, the County will make an ultimate determination as to the optimal way to move forward with the divestiture.</p>
<p>23.</p>	<p>While the RFQ seems pretty straight forward in it's goal to identify qualified firms to propose plans for the purchase of the county's assets, part 2, 'Approach to Divestiture' appears out of place in this reference. This section asks for responses to a selection of scenarios for which most of the important data used in the planning process has not been included and in fact is not readily available. Unless the County supplies more information, such as its plan to manage the flow of material from the county, such as contracted volume into specific transfer stations, MSW pricing into the facilities it will be a huge task to respond with even an guess of the value of the assets. Has the County considered extending the deadline for response to this RFQ to give firms more time to work with the County to develop data that will enable better responses?</p>	<p>The County believes the "Approach to Divestiture" is appropriate to include in the RFQ and in determining the shortlisted Proposers. The question appears to focus on <u>Part B, Volume 1, Section 2.4</u>. The County <u>does not</u> expect Proposers to undertake extensive due diligence or expend significant resources/costs in order to respond to the RFQ and this specific section. The County anticipates providing additional information in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted Proposers and that it would be during that time that Proposers will be expected to undertake the level of due diligence they believe necessary to submit a binding proposal. At this stage and in recognition of the timing of the SOQ responses, the level of available information and the County's desire to not have the Proposers expend significant resources/costs, the responses to <u>Part B, Volume 1, Section 2.4</u> are not included within the evaluation and the responses will not be scored or otherwise considered in shortlisting Proposers (note, however, that a responsive SOQ <u>must</u> respond to this Section). Proposer's responses are intended to provide useful information as the County assesses whether to proceed with the divestiture process and, as it</p>

		begins to develop RFP and contract documents for the industry review and RFP phase, to understand what variables and elements are likely to have the greatest impact on value (positive or negative) and, ultimately, achieving the County's goals. Accordingly, the County believes the information about the Assets provided in the RFQ and available in the data room is sufficient for Proposers to provide basic ranges of estimates for the identified scenarios and respond to <u>Part B, Volume 1, Section 2.4.</u>
24.	Has the County considered dropping the 'Approach to Divestiture' section, and instead work with the selected firms to develop a more concise plan where all of the material information can be produced and used in the planning and decision making process?	The County will not delete the "Approach to Divestiture" section, but does anticipate working very interactively with the shortlisted Proposers during industry review and the RFP phase to develop an approach which achieves the County's goals and is of interest to the shortlisted Proposers.
25.	Will the County give potential responders access to visit the sites?	The County will consider providing site access and tours following shortlisting and as part of the industry review process.
26.	There are various contracts for services at the County sites including at the landfill the gas/energy management, greenwaste processing, and various other consultant and operating agreements. How are these to be managed if the asset is divested?	These issues will be addressed in detail in the industry review phase and RFP phase and shortlisted Proposers will be encouraged to provide input on this topic.
27.	Is there to be some form of rate setting whereby the rates set by the Transfer Station owner must get ratified or approved by a government body?	To the extent the question is focused on whether the County will require approval of tip fees or other rates established at Transfer Stations after the divestiture, it is premature to answer this question. We anticipate that these topics that will be addressed during industry review and in the RFP phase, and

		the County will be interested in receiving shortlisted Proposer input on these topics
28.	The CIWMB is considering requiring doors on the Transfer Station. How would the retrofit process work after a private owner was operating the station? Would the fee setting be unencumbered so that the capital costs could be recovered quickly?	Once escrow is closed and the divestiture complete, the purchaser shall have total responsibility to address any future requirements. See answer to Question #27 on fee setting.
29.	Has the BAAQMD established controls over the TS operation regarding traffic and dust controls?	It is the County's understanding that the Title V permit and the Permit to Operate applies to the landfill only. That would include those operations and infrastructure, such as compost and access roads that are on the landfill. However, the County is responsible for dust control at the "site".
30.	When is the 5 year anniversary of the Solid Waste Permit? Any violations that have occurred that need correction, e.g. litter control and abatement?	The current SWFP, issued September 2, 2005, is on a three year review cycle, with the application for a permit review due to be submitted on March 19, 2008. The County is currently investigating the ability to extend the deadline for submittal of the permit review application until mid-2009. The only recent alleged violation at the Central Landfill pertains to the submittal of final closure and post-closure documentation. This alleged violation would be resolved by the Stipulated Notice and Order for future submittal of final closure and post-closure documentation currently being negotiated by the County and the LEA/CIWMB.
31.	What is the status of the access road condition? When is the next maintenance repaving schedule?	No repaving is currently scheduled. During the industry review phase, the Proposers may have the opportunity for a site visit and should satisfy themselves as to its condition.
32.	Any equipment owned and operated by the County that transfers with the TS facility, e.g. front loader tractors,	All Transfer Station equipment at the Annapolis, Guerneville, Healdsburg and Sonoma

	sweepers, water truck?	Transfer Stations is owned, operated and maintained by West Sonoma County Disposal, the County's contract operator. Limited equipment owned by the County, consisting of 4-5 pieces of equipment used in the Central Transfer Station, may be included in the transaction. Equipment to be included in the transaction, if any, is an issue that will be addressed in detail in the industry review and RFP phase and shortlisted proposers will be encouraged to provide input on this topic.
33.	What has been the record regarding occurrence of fires at the Transfer Stations? Are the customers cooperative regarding anti-smoking?	Smoking is prohibited and customers are required to comply. Fires have occasionally occurred, primarily during the winter, when people tend to dispose of fireplace ashes in their garbage. The County has not suffered major facility damage or operation interruption associated with a fire at any of the facilities.
34.	What has been the record regarding occurrence of customer depositing non-acceptable items?	The County does not knowingly accept prohibited waste. Records of the load check program will be made available to shortlisted Proposers.
35.	What is the e-waste program now in place and anticipated to be the responsibility of the Transfer Station operator?	The sites all currently accept e-waste. Whether the new operator is requested to continue this program is an issue that will be addressed in detail in the industry review and RFP phase and shortlisted Proposers will be encouraged to provide input on this topic.
36.	What is the status of the RDSI or JTD? When is the next 5 year review of the document and the Solid Waste Permit due?	There is no separate RDSI document for the Central Landfill Transfer Station. The JTD is current. The most recent amendment to the JTD was May of 2005.  See answer to Question # 30.
37.	What is the status of the closure plan? Is it approved	See answer to Question # 12.

	by the LEA and CIWMB?	
38.	What is the status of the stage of closure of the landfill units? Done? In-progress? What is the current posture of the LEA and CIWMB regarding the state of closure?	See answer to Question # 12.
39.	What is the amount of the Closure/Postclosure Fund? Is this tax based? Does it transfer with the change of ownership? Would or could the County continue to provide the tax base financing?	See answer to Question #14. Funds are collected through the tipping fees, not taxes. Whether existing funds are transferred is an issue that will be addressed in detail in the industry review and RFP phase and shortlisted proposers will be encouraged to provide input on this topic.
40.	What form of environmental review has been conducted for the West Valley prospective landfill space? Some? None?	None. However, there are two current preliminary feasibility/siting studies for the West Canyon Expansion available in the data room.
41.	What is the County's position on developing a rock quarry to process the excess rocks to be removed to develop the suspected landfill capacity?	The County has, in the past, considered quarrying the rock for sale as part of the potential West Canyon expansion. The County did quarry rock at Central for offsite sale in the past. This will be addressed in more detail in the industry review and RFP phase, and shortlisted Proposers will be encouraged to provide input on this topic.
42.	What is the anticipated degree of opposition to reopening the landfill operation in the West Valley area or overtopping the existing landfill areas?	The County cannot speculate on potential opposition on reopening the landfill for the West Canyon. However, County residents and environmental groups have a long history of supporting in-County waste disposal as the "environmentally responsible" approach to waste handling. As an example, the East Canyon expansion was supported by the local chapter of the Sierra Club
43a.	Please provide detailed financial information for each of the transfer station sites referenced in the RFQ, with detailed breakdowns and operating statistics related	<b>43 a-d.</b> The County budget is aggregated to cover all activities with all revenue received by the County. The County does not run each

	<p>thereto. The information should include the following for each transfer station:</p> <p>(a) Total revenue, incoming tonnage and tip fees by material type.</p>	<p>Transfer Station as an individual business enterprise, nor do we have variable fees at the various sites therefore. Accordingly, this information is not available at this time. See additional information on this topic, which has been added to the data room.</p>
43b.	<p><b>(b) Transfer Station Operations</b></p> <p>(i) Total staffing, hours worked and wage/benefits rates by labor category (operations and admin),</p> <p>(ii) Inventory listing of all front line and back up equipment used in transfer station operations (on and off-road) including description, make/model/year and to-date hours for each piece of equipment,</p> <p>(iii) A general description of the daily operations at each site.</p> <p>(iv) Source of fueling.</p> <p>(v) Type of scales and weighing systems both at the scale house and loading areas.</p>	
43c.	<p><b>(c) Transportation</b></p> <p>(i) Outgoing tonnage, number of loads and tons/load by material type, by site destination (i.e., landfilled trash, organics, other recyclable/recoverable materials, etc.),</p> <p>(ii) Mileage, routes and avg. hours to each landfill or processing destination,</p> <p>(iii) Current cost per load (or per ton) for transportation to each landfill or processing destination, with an indication as to whether transportation is performed using employees or subcontractors (and who the subcontractors are) (Note: if employees are used, total staffing, hours worked and wage/benefits rates).</p> <p>(iv) Description and make/model/year for all front line and back up equipment used for transportation.</p> <p>(v) Source of fueling.</p>	
43d.	<p><b>(d) Disposal/Processing</b></p>	

	<p>(i) Total outgoing tonnage to each disposal/processing site and the cost per ton for disposal/processing at each site.</p> <p>(ii) Any fees or taxes that are paid to government agencies related to incoming or outgoing tonnage, and the method of assessment.</p>	
44.	<p>We are unclear of what the minimally acceptable criterion are for Section 6.2 (page A-22). Could you explain what you consider the minimum necessary to pass each of these criteria?</p>	<p>Except for <u>Part A, Section 6.2 (a)</u>, the County has not developed any bright line criteria for the items in <u>Part A, Section 6.2</u>, but rather, intends to look at the totality of the Proposer's submission in order to assess financial capability (<u>Part A, Section 6.2(b)</u>), experience and expertise (<u>Part A, Section 6.2(c)</u>) and disclosed information under <u>Part B, Volume 1, Section 1.9 (Part A, Section 6.2(d))</u>. The pass/fail criteria are intended to assess whether a Proposer meets minimum qualifications so they are eligible for substantive evaluation under <u>Part A, Section 6.3</u> and shortlisting.</p>
45.	<p>We are unclear of the intent of Section 6.2(d) (page A-22). We are wondering if there is a typo. Could you clarify?</p>	<p>Yes, there is a typo. The reference should have been to <u>Part B, Volume 1, Section 1.9</u>. See Addendum #1 for the correction.</p>
46.	<p>Will all of the Proposers who receive a Pass on Section 6.2, receive the RFP and be allowed to propose in accordance with the RFP?</p>	<p>A "pass" on Section 6.2 alone does not automatically qualify a Proposer to continue to the RFP. For those Proposers that "pass" the "pass/fail criteria" under <u>Part A, Section 6.2</u>, the County will undertake the evaluation under <u>Part A, Section 6.3</u> and shortlist on the basis of that evaluation. The County will consider a number of factors in making the ultimate shortlist determination, including without limitation, the scores of Proposers, the number of Proposers that are eligible for shortlisting, the elements of the industry review process and what will produce a robust, yet manageable, RFP competition.</p>

47.	It would be helpful if we knew what the evaluation criteria were for Section 6.3 while preparing the SOQ. Could you explain what the criterion will be and how they will be judged?	<u>Part A, Section 6.3</u> sets out the two substantive evaluation categories (Proposer Background and Experience and Approach to Divestiture), the points allocated to those categories and the specific evaluation criteria that will be used to evaluate the SOQs. Proposals will be evaluated based on responses to the criteria, with emphasis on the demonstrated capability of Proposers to complete the divestiture and any post closing conditions in accordance with the terms and conditions of the lease or purchase and sale agreement.
48.	Volume 1 of the SOQ is to be limited to 35 pages, but Section 1.6 of the SOQ requests that we provide a brief description of the Relevant Experience for the 6 types of projects. This will amount to hundreds of projects and therefore many pages. How would you prefer that companies with “extensive” experience summarize their experience and still stay within the 35 pages?	<u>Part B, Volume 1, Section 1.6</u> does not require that the Proposer describe every project that falls within the identified categories. The Proposers have the discretion to choose which and the number of projects that best demonstrate their relevant experience. In addition, as noted in <u>Part B, Volume 1, Section 1.7</u> , lengthy project descriptions may be included in <u>Volume 3, Section C</u> of the SOQ, which is not included within the 35 page limitation.
49.	To respond to Section 1.9.2 on page B-4, should we use an order of magnitude or materiality criterion in listing “Notice of Violations” or “Areas of Concern”? There is another side to this issue. We operate several facilities under operating contracts with municipal customers where we have limited scope of responsibilities. In many cases the “Notice of Violations” or “Areas of Concern” have been for infractions that were beyond our scope of services and therefore are not within our control to resolve; do you want us to list such items and if so how would you want us to qualify such items?	<u>Part B, Volume 1, Section 1.9.2</u> requests information concerning instances during the last 5 years where the named entities have been determined to have materially breached a contract or violated applicable law. If a matter is still pending or in a dispute proceeding, it need not be included. In addition, if a facility has violated applicable law, but the violation was not within the scope of work of the applicable entity, it need not be included.
50.	In order to effectively respond to the request for the Preliminary Non-Binding Valuation of the Assets, we	The Sonoma County Waste Management Agency is currently funded from \$4.50/ton of the

	<p>will need to have a better understanding of the current revenue and expense stream for each of the individual operations, including the 5 transfer operations, the compost operation, the Landfill Gas operation and the household hazardous waste operation. For instance, what portion of the currently posted tipping fee can we plan to receive as net revenue? Perhaps a better way to get at the question is, what portion in dollars of the current tipping fee will the County want to retain?</p>	<p>tipping fee collected at the Transfer Stations. The Agency funds the HHW building operation from these funds. The wood and yard waste processing is also paid for by the Agency, funded by the fees collected for drop off of wood and yard waste at the 5 Transfer Stations. A portion of the current tip fee is used to fund the post-closure maintenance of the 7 closed landfill sites. The portion of the current tip fee, if any, the County will want to retain is an issue that will be addressed in detail in the industry review and RFP phase and shortlisted proposers will be encouraged to provide input on this topic.</p>
51.	<p>Can you provide a brief summary of the number and job classification of the employees deployed at each of the operations?</p>	<p>The Annapolis, Guerneville, Healdsburg, and Sonoma Transfer Stations each have one cashier (DWI). All other staff at those sites are employees of the contractors. The remaining staff are all deployed at the Central Transfer Facility. Please refer to the Refuse Enterprise Organizational chart which has been added to the data room.</p>
52.	<p>Has the County received a job specific Prevailing Wage Determination for the landfill operation from the Department of Industrial Relations? If not, what wage rate does the County wish us to utilize for a scenario where the County retains ownership of the facilities? Please note that the Department of Industrial Relations has not established a “Landfill Worker (Operating Engineers)” classification for Northern California. The Heavy &amp; Highway classification is for the seasonal employees that don’t work during bad weather or during most of the winter. Landfill operations do not close down during bad weather or during the winter so utilizing the Heavy &amp; Highway classification isn’t productive.</p>	<p>No. To the extent the County considers a structure which would result in the retention of one or more of the Assets, this is an issue that will be addressed in detail in the industry review and RFP phase and shortlisted Proposers will be encouraged to provide input on this topic.</p>
53.	<p>The RFQ generally discusses the various fixed equipment and rolling stock that the County has</p>	<p>See answer to Question #32.</p>

	<p>deployed to the various facilities. Can you provide a list of this equipment and a book value for same? We also specifically will want to know what equipment that is currently being utilized by the County to operate the facilities that will not come along with the rest of the assets.</p>	
54.	<p>Similarly there are several jobs/accounts shown in the list of expenditures that we have insufficient information to determine if all or a portion would be transferred to the Proposer or retained by the County. Further on this if the expenditure were transferred then to which of the lines of business would they be transferred to? The list includes 0999, 6909, 6913, 6914, 6915, 6920, 6921, 6929, 6930 and 6942. We need to understand cost structure of each operation in order to determine the potential profitability and therefore its value.</p>	<p>Job number 0999 is used when Refuse does miscellaneous work for other divisions or departments. Job numbers 6909 (diversion), 6913 (wood waste), 6914 (yard waste), and 6915 (HHW) are used by the Sonoma County Waste Management Agency. Job numbers 6920 (County AB 939 Diversion Programs) and 6929 (General Operations) are used by operations staff. Job number 6942 (General Environmental Compliance) is used for general environmental expenses and some of it is allocable to the Central Landfill site. As a result of changes made to the FY 07/08 budget, job number 6921 is administrative work done by management staff and is not included in the budget for operations or environmental compliance. Job number 6930 is computer programming and equipment.</p>
55.	<p>Typically operations like smaller convenience stations or transfer stations, HHW and compost operations are subsidized by the other higher volume/revenue operations. We need to understand if the County is willing to give up the system wide disposal rate leveling and allow each of the operations to stand on their own revenue stream or if the County wants the status quo to remain in place?</p>	<p>Whether the County will have any involvement in future rate setting or other operational issues is an issue that will be addressed in detail in the industry review and RFP phase and shortlisted proposers will be encouraged to provide input on this topic. Reference should also be made to <u>Part A, Section 2.2</u> which outlines the County's preliminary goals, including that there be a location for solid waste disposal of the municipal solid waste at reasonable prices.</p>
56.	<p>The RFQ discusses the AB939 related diversion rates.</p>	<p>Continuation and/or enhancement of existing</p>

	<p>However, it does not discuss the Proposer’s responsibilities/ requirements for achieving/maintaining these diversion rates or any expected enhancements to the programs. Can you elaborate on the County’s expectations?</p>	<p>diversion programs is an issue that will be addressed in detail in the industry review and RFP phase and shortlisted Proposers will be encouraged to provide input on this topic.</p>
57.	<p>The current contract with West Sonoma County Disposal runs until August 31, 2010. There does not appear to be a clause for termination of that contract if the County goes forward with the divestiture. Can you explain the County’s intent for termination of the West Sonoma County Disposal agreement or is it the intent for said agreement to run to term and then transfer control of the various facilities?</p>	<p>The County amended the transfer station operations contract in 2005 in order to set a new termination date of 2010 which coincides with the termination date of the outhaul contracts and County refuse licenses for the unincorporated areas. Section 15.3 of the transfer station operations contract could allow for the termination of the contract by the County. Section 10 of the contract allows the assignment of the contract by the County with the operator’s consent. Whether the transfer station operations contract is assumed by the new operator or is terminated by the County is an issue that will be addressed in detail in the industry review and RFP phase and shortlisted proposers will be encouraged to provide input on this topic.</p>
58.	<p>The RFQ refers to the County’s current “interim out-haul contract” but a copy of same is not included in the reference information. It could take some time to secure the permits for the landfill expansion and reopen the landfill to accept the entire waste volume, so we would like to know if that contract is transferable or assignable to the selected acquirer/contractor. Can you provide a copy of the agreements?</p>	<p>There are three outhaul agreements that have been added to the materials available in the data room.</p>
59.	<p>On page B-13, Section C, Key Personnel – There is a requirement that we provide two references for each of the key personnel and specifically the references to be previous agencies or clients with whom we have worked in the past 5 years. Could you elaborate on what you are looking for here? What references would you want to see for Key Personnel who have worked for the same major solid waste company for the past five years and who provide solid waste disposal services to millions of clients each year?</p>	<p><u>Part B, Volume 1, Section C</u> asks for references only for those key personnel that will be involved with further development of the Central Landfill, focusing on re-permitting and new permitting issues. References are intended to be from agencies or clients that the individual may have worked with (e.g., if the Proposer operates a municipal</p>

		landfill, someone from the municipality). However, if the proposed key personnel individual has just worked on solid waste assets owned by the Proposer and there are no third parties that can provide a reference, the Proposer may so indicate and will not be responsible for providing references. See Addendum #1.
60.	Will we have the opportunity to ask for any further clarifications once we receive the planned response to questions?	Yes. See Addendum #1. Note, however, that the County has no intention to extend the SOQ Due Date.
61.	Section 2.1 Description of the Assets: Please confirm that the County intends to assign all of the contracts associated with the Landfill Gas-to-Energy facility to the successful proposer, and if not, which contracts would be excluded?	The landfill gas recovery facility is currently among the Assets being offered for divestiture; however, it is premature to answer this question. Whether the landfill gas to energy contracts will be assigned to the new operator is a topic that will be addressed during industry review and in the RFP phase and the County will be interested in receiving shortlisted Proposer input on this topic.
62.	Section 2.5.2 – Key Environmental Issues: The document states that Landfill 2 currently has no known environmental issues. Has the Regional Water Quality Control Board issued correspondence concurring with this finding? What expenses has the County incurred to date to repair the liner and anchor trench, and remediate the previous release? Is there a time line and associated budget for future remediation and monitoring specific to this cell?	The referenced RFQ language concerns the County’s own remediation and subsequent monitoring of Landfill 2. The County anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted proposers. There are no further remediation activities planned for Landfill 2 at this time, and all monitoring for Landfill 2 is included in the regular on-going monitoring for the entire Central Landfill.
63.	Section 2.4.5 – CEQA Analysis Relating to Divestiture: We understand the County is undertaking the necessary analyses required for the divestiture. What is the status of this effort, and when does the County expect to have the CEQA process completed?	The County is at the preliminary stage of determining what level of new CEQA documentation, if any, will be required in order to complete the divestiture. The County's goal is to complete

		such documentation prior to the closing of the divestiture transaction.
64.	Section 4.5 – Project Documents: The County has compiled an impressive electronic database. However, there may be other documents of value that are not listed in the project library – for example, the landfill Joint Technical Document/Closure – Post-Closure Maintenance Plan. Can additional information be made available to the proposers during the RFQ period, and what mechanism would be preferred to request and obtain specific information?	The County has added some additional documents to the data room based on the questions set forth in this matrix and anticipates augmenting it further after shortlisting.
65.	Section 6.2 (c). Pass/Fail Criteria: What constitutes a “passing grade” for expertise, and how does this differ from the evaluation criteria in Section 6.3.1?	See answer to Question #44. While the County will use the same SOQ submission materials to assess the pass/fail categories set forth in Part A, Section 6.2 as it will in evaluating Part A, Section 6.3, the criteria are different and the latter items will be qualitatively scored using the criteria set forth in the section.
66.	Section 6.2 (d). Pass/Fail Criteria: This Section states that information disclosed in response to Part B, Volume 1, Section 1.1 shall not materially affect the proposer’s ability to carry out the work. The latter reference is to the legal name of the proposer. This appears to be in error. What is the intent of this pass/fail criteria item?	See answer to Question #45.
67.	Section 1.1 - The RFQ references that net revenues from power generation are in the range of \$2.4MM. The financial data included with the RFQ indicates that this revenue is net of costs. How much of this net revenue did the County actually receive in the past 12 months? How much electricity is currently produced by the co-generation plant on an annual average?	Please refer to Landfill Gas Expense and Revenue Tracking in the Financial documents in the data room. All listed revenues are received. Current production has been fluctuating between 5-6 Megawatts.
68.	Section 1.1 - Does an analysis of the West Canyon expansion area rock exist? It is described as highly marketable. What information supports this statement? Does any information exist on what percentage of the 19MM cubic yards of excavation required in the West expansion area is soil vs. rock? Will conventional equipment be capable of removing the material or will	Refer to Siting and Classification Study and Area Development Plan under the West Expansion section of Environmental documents in the data room. Blasting is expected to be necessary.

	blasting be required?	
69.	Section 2.1.1 - Were tentative WDRs ever issued for the use of the remaining 22.8 acres of Landfill 2? What type of lining system was envisioned by the WDR or in discussions with the RWQCB?	The County anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted proposers. See also answer to Question #20.
70.	Section 2.1.1 - What types of revenues and costs does the County receive and incur from the entity who operates the 25 acre composting operation for the Sonoma County Waste Management Agency? Is there a lease arrangement in place with the Sonoma County Waste Management Agency and the County or simply a Memorandum of Understanding? Will or can this arrangement survive the sale of assets to another entity or should the proposers assume that operation of the compost facility will be conducted or contracted for by them? Similar issues are prevalent for the Household Hazardous Waste Facility.	Please refer to Section 5 of the Joint Powers Agreement dated 2-11-1992, as well as agreements titled Clean Harbors for the HHW operation and Sonoma Compost Company for composting operation under Contracts in the data room. The County receives no revenues from either program and all revenues go to the Sonoma County Waste Management Agency. The County incurs minor expenses associated with coordination of permits related to storm water. The Agency is currently underway on a project to relocate the compost operation off of the Central Landfill site. What the Proposer would like to do with the compost operation in the interim or in the future is an issue that will be addressed in detail in the industry review and RFP phase and shortlisted Proposers will be encouraged to provide input on this topic. The HHW facility is expected to remain as it currently exists on the site and in operation following the divestiture.
71.	Section 2.1.1 - Please confirm the regulatory status of the Hammel Road mitigation. The links to the RFQ would indicate that all required work and monitoring as part of the five year plan has been completed. Review of the material would indicate that the project has been successful and that only periodic maintenance and monitoring is currently required.	Correct.

72.	Section 2.1.1 - Does the County flow-control waste from the unincorporated County areas to the County assets? If so is this done through franchise collection agreements or another mechanism?	Yes, it is accomplished through existing licensing agreements.
73.	Section 2.1.1 - Please verify that the County will keep the Central Landfill from being "closed" by the CIWMB during the divestiture and WDR issuance processes?	See answer to Question # 12.
74.	Section 2.1.1 - Please provide information on the current rates for operation and transfer of refuse from various transfer stations that are currently being managed by the third party (ie. per ton operations cost and rate per ton per mile for transfer, etc.). The agreements included with the RFQ do not appear to contain up to date information.	For the period September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008, WSCD is paid \$507,241 annually (\$42,270 monthly) to manage Annapolis, Guerneville, Healdsburg and Sonoma Transfer Stations and \$2205.45 monthly to collect and recycle tires from all sites. Transfer of refuse is not included in the operations and maintenance agreement, and is conducted pursuant to the provisions in Exhibit E of the Out-Haul Agreement with WSCD available in the data room.
75.	Section 2.3.1 - Please clarify the percentage and type of volume (ie. route collection from city franchise areas) that was received from direct haul to the Central Landfill when it was in operation versus the portion that was delivered from transfer operations throughout the County.	See attached chart "Waste Delivered Directly to Central Landfill versus Transferred from Other Facilities" available in the data room.
76.	Section 3.2 - Is there a detailed equipment list available that indicates number of hours and maintenance history of the yellow iron?	Please refer to answer to Question #32.
77.	We will need a set of site development plans in 24X36 format as well as digital CAD files (ie. base and fill grades, etc).	The County anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted Proposers.
78.	How many acres of future liner have to be constructed to gain the listed remaining permitted capacity in Landfills 1 & 2?	How many acres of liner will be required is subject to future negotiations with permitting agencies.
		The only area of Landfill 1 and 2

79.	How many acres are already filled to capacity?	that is filled to final grade is the south facing slope of Landfill 1. All other areas have not been filled to finished grades.
80.	If not filled to capacity how many acres of liner are already in place?	East Canyon consists of approximately 20 acres of lined landfill. Landfill 1 was constructed prior to Subtitle D regulations in the early 1970's in accordance with regulations at that time. Neither Landfill 1 nor Landfill 2 is filled to capacity.
81.	Total acres of buffer or non fill land but included in the permit?	The total area permitted for refuse disposal is approximately 150 acres. Landfill 1 covers an area of approximately 130 acres and Landfill 2 covers an additional area of approximately 43 acres, half of which has been constructed. The permitted portion of both Landfills 1 and 2 is located within the 399-acre site.
82.	How many of the filled acres are certified closed?	See answer to Question #12.
83.	For permitted fill areas that are yet to be lined in Landfills 1 & 2 what is the average depth of cut for excavation (used to establish part of the soil balance)?	A lateral expansion of Landfill 2 has not been planned; therefore, excavation quantities are not applicable.  The compost area will not require any excavations. Portions of the Rock Extraction Area in Landfill 1 will require blasting and excavation averaging an estimated depth of 7' in very isolated areas.
84.	Is there an estimate of the total number of cubic yards of excavation remaining to develop the currently permitted remaining airspace yards in Landfills 1 and 2?	No.
85.	How many gallons of leachate and methane gas condensate is disposed of per year (historical)?	Approximately 22 million gallons per year.
		Based on 22 million gallons per

86.	What is the cost per gallon for Transportation and Disposal of leachate at present time?	<p>year, the County's costs have been consistent with the following:</p> <p>Treatment: Approximately \$94,160 per year.</p> <p>Hauling: Approximately \$396,000 per year.</p>
87.	Are all liner and cap construction clay materials available on site? If not what is the soil yardage shortfall that has to be imported? What is the current cost per unit for that imported soil?	The County has added some additional information to the data room and anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted Proposers.
88.	Is all the soil needed for daily and intermediate cover available on site? If not, is an offsite borrow area used, is it included with the deal and how far from the active site is it?	See answer to Question #10. There is no current arrangement for an offsite borrow source.
89.	In total does the site have a positive soil balance or will purchased soil be required?	See answer to Question #10
90.	Given the depth of information requested and the requirement to provide preliminary range of purchase prices for the assets, we would appreciate the opportunity to perform a site walk to review the assets and gain first hand knowledge of the various aspects of the project. The RFQ did not indicate that a facilities review would be part of the process but we would appreciate the opportunity to participate in one and believe it would ultimately be beneficial to the all interested parties.	See answer to Question #25
91.	Taking into account the basis for the site walk request noted above as well as the upcoming holiday season, providing some additional time to respond to the RFQ would be very helpful in terms of producing a thorough end product. We request that the County consider extending the submittal date for the RFQ to incorporate 2-3 weeks of additional response time so that some additional time for technical and financial pro-forma preparation be granted to the project teams.	The County believes the current schedule is feasible given the materials requested for the SOQs. See also the answer to Question #23

92.	Page A-8: Clarification of the double negative in this sentence which describes the current contract with RLI, "It is not anticipated that the current direct haul of this waste will not continue beyond the termination of the existing interim outhaul agreement, which expires in August 2010."	See answer to Question #3 and Addendum # 1.
93.	Page A-9: In reference to the County and Cities it states that there are presently no contractual commitments from any of the Cities to the Assets. Will there be some sort of flow control? What stops cities from constructing their own transfer stations and directing waste to their own facility?	The topic of flow control for County waste and waste from the cities will be a topic discussed during industry review and the RFP phase and the County will be interested in receiving shortlisted Proposer input on this topic. There is nothing that precludes a city from constructing a transfer station, but given the capital costs, volumes of waste involved, the permitting/regulatory environment, no city has taken any steps to do so. Concurrent with the ongoing divestiture process, the County has initiated discussions with the cities regarding their potential role.
94.	Page A-10: Is the 9.0M cyds of remaining permitted airspace inclusive of the remaining 22.8 acres of Landfill 2, which requires new WDR's? If so, how much of the 9.0M cyds is the new WDR area in landfill 2? Section C, which goes into more detail, is even more unclear.	New WDRs will be required for the remaining phases (3, 4 & 5) comprising the 22.8 acres of Landfill 2.  There are approximately 4.5 MM cyds of remaining air space in phases 3, 4 and 5 of Landfill 2 with the remainder in Landfill 1.
95.	Page A-10: What is the County's EIR certification and approval process?	The County's EIR process is set forth in Chapter 23A of the Sonoma County Code which can be found at <a href="http://municipalcodes.lexisnexis.com/codes/sonomaco/">http://municipalcodes.lexisnexis.com/codes/sonomaco/</a> .
96.	Page A-11: Are any of the transfer stations permitted to take other materials for processing like C&D?	None of the Transfer Stations have permits that allow any on-site processing and all materials are transferred offsite.
97.	Page A-18: Would County consider extending the deadline for the SOQ by 60 days (currently due 01/08)?	See answer to Question #23 and #91.

	Please note that the release of the RFQ and the deadline for the SOQ take place during the holidays, a time when many key people needed for this process will not be available.	
98.	Would the County have the ability to terminate the existing Michigan Cogeneration Systems and Viasyn agreements if a divestiture of the Central LF is consummated?	The contracts can be terminated if the County so desires. See answer to Question # 61.
99.	What is the County's position with respect to any current union CBA's (Operating Engineers in particular)?	The current collective bargaining agreements do not contain successor employer provisions. It is premature to discuss the County's position relative to any such conditions of sale. This topic will be addressed during industry review and in the RFP phase. The County will be interested in receiving shortlisted Proposer input on this topic.
100.	Have any other cities besides Petaluma given any indication (formal or informal) of their intent to terminate their participation in the existing JPA Agreement?	The County is unaware of any cities' intent (including Petaluma) to terminate their participation in the existing JPA Agreement. The JPA Agreement covers diversion and planning activities. More importantly, in the fall of 2006, the Town of Windsor sent out an RFP for collection services that allowed for proposals that would not utilize the County disposal system. All bids received by the Town of Windsor utilized the County disposal system.
101.	Has the County ever attempted to secure Class II permitting for the West Canyon?	No.
102.	It is our understanding that the County is open to selling their fixed assets individually or as a package, please confirm?	The County intends to divest the Assets as a package, but reserves the right to divest individual Assets or groups of Assets separately. The County intends to discuss this issue with the shortlisted Proposers and make a final decision on this issue

		during industry review and the RFP phase.
103.	Assuming the purchaser seeks to invest in recycling and post collection processing at one or more sites, will the County attempt to flow-control or impose fees on the residue associated with recycling activities?	The County intends to discuss this issue with the shortlisted Proposers and make a final decision on this issue during industry review and the RFP phase.
104.	What are the levels of constituents in the underdrain system after the repairs were completed? The County referenced "nearly non-detect" levels after repairs were completed.	Concentrations more recently have ranged between 1 and 2 parts per billion net VOCs. Prior to repairs VOC levels were 70 parts per billion or higher and SVOCs were also present.
105.	What is the CURRENT estimate of Closure/Post Closure liability? Did an outside firm audit this amount? Would the current enterprise fund and/or funds accrued for closure/post closure be included as an "asset" to be transacted to the purchaser of the contemplated assets?	See answer to Questions #13, #14, and #39.
106.	The County has identified a preliminary goal of <u>reducing or eliminating</u> the County's exposure for past, current, and future environmental, operational and closure/post closure liabilities related to all assets. When will estimates of all liabilities be made available to responders? Who developed them? Have they been audited? Where are "certified" numbers? Will ultimate responsibility and balance of liabilities be negotiated, or has the County established a firm position?	The County does not have firm estimates of past, present and future environmental liabilities (it does have information on closure/post-closure and post-closure maintenance estimates, which will be posted in the data room). The County understands the importance of this issue. This topic will be discussed during industry review and the RFP phase and the County will be interested in receiving shortlisted Proposer input on this topic. Subject to other considerations that may be impacted, reduction or elimination of the County's future liabilities is an important goal of divestiture.
107.	Can the proposed purchase of any asset include conditions of future approval and permitting?	The County is assessing and considering a number of potential methods to address the permitting status at the Central Landfill in the context of closing a divestiture transaction. This topic will be discussed during industry review and the RFP

		phase and the County will be interested in receiving shortlisted Proposer input on this topic.
108.	A July 23, 2007 letter from CIWMB requesting closure documents for Central Landfill. Is this a request for Closure, or a request for funding of closure, or technical and/or financial documentation for closure?	<p>Based on discussions with the LEA and the CIWMB, the County views the letter as a request to submit final closure and post-closure documentation. The County and the LEA/CIWMB are currently negotiating a Stipulated Notice and Order for future submittal of final closure and post-closure documentation.</p> <p>The County understands that the CIWMB will look to separately address closure/post-closure cost funding.</p>
109.	What is the status of the facilities WDRs as it relates to corrective action at landfill 1. Can the proposed purchase of any asset include conditions of future approval and permitting?	The County is implementing a corrective action monitoring program as outlined in the Monitoring & Reporting Program of the WDR Order No. R1-2004-0040. In regard to the compliance time schedule contained in the WDR for Landfill 1, the County believes that it has complied with all tasks except the item related to leachate removal activities, which has a compliance date of August 15, 2009. The County continues to work with the Regional Water Quality Control Board to ensure compliance with this task. See answer to Question #107 regarding conditions on future approval and permitting.
110.	What is the status of the leachate pipeline?	Construction has not been accepted as completed. It is expected to be operational by spring 2008.
111.	What factors does the County expect to use from the divestiture-related CEQA analysis to determine whether or not to proceed with a sale of assets?	As with any CEQA analysis that is required, the County intends to use it inform as to whether the divestiture results in any environmental impacts and, if so, the manner in which they can be

		mitigated and whether the divestiture is the appropriate alternative chosen.
112.	When does the County expect to complete the divestiture-related CEQA analysis?	See answer to Question #63.
113.	Is the County willing to entertain a proposal for just the sale of the transfer stations, and if so, is the County willing to not place restrictions on the new owner's ability to haul to out-of-county landfills?	See answer to Question #102. Outhaul issues can be addressed in the industry review and RFP stage of the divestiture process.
114.	Is the County willing to retain all past, present and future liabilities, such as environmental, landfill operational, closure and post closure and corrective action liabilities, including those associated with the closed landfills that are adjacent to transfer stations and that may impact the transfer station property in the future?	See answer to Question #106. The County's current intention is to retain ownership and control of closed facilities adjacent to current transfer stations. While the County remains open to any reasonable proposal, it is not currently anticipated that the County would propose to shift environmental liabilities related to such closed facilities to a purchaser.
115.	Will the proposer be asked to continue to provide ongoing post closure maintenance at the seven closed landfills?	See answer to Question #114. The foregoing notwithstanding, it is anticipated that a purchaser would be required to provide necessary access and cooperate with the County in its performance of such activities.
116.	If the County is to retain the landfill assets and liabilities, is there an expectation of the amount the County will want to add to the transfer station tipping fees to cover County retained expenses?	Answers to questions related to which Assets might be retained, control over tip fees and related matters are premature at this point. We anticipate that these topics will be addressed during industry review and in the RFP phase, and the County will be interested in receiving shortlisted Proposer input on these topics.
117.	On Page C-5 the RFQ addresses the household hazardous waste (HHW) facility operation. The RFQ states "The HHW facility is owned and operated by the Sonoma County Waste Management Agency (Agency)..." Please clarify the relationships among the "Agency", the "County", the County Department of	See answer to Question #70. The Sonoma County Department of Health Services, Environmental Health Division is the Local Enforcement Agency ("LEA") and has authority from the California Integrated Waste Management

	Transportation and Public Works, and the County Department of Health Services, they relate to this divestiture.	Board (“CIWMB”) to act in the capacity of the enforcement agency for the Central Landfill and transfer stations pursuant to Public Resource Code Section 43200 <i>et seq.</i> The Department of Transportation and Public Works is the department of the County responsible to operate the assets.
118.	<p>Beyond the green and wood waste recycling facilities listed on RFQ Page ES-2, neither the “Recycling Area” or “Reuse Area” described in Section C are listed as an “Asset”,</p> <p>Are these recycling/reuse operations, including other recycling/reuse operations listed in Section C of the RFQ, part of the proposed Asset divestiture?</p>	Yes.
119.	How much tonnage is currently being diverted Countywide from landfilling and how much diversion is desired?	<p>The 2005 Annual Report includes a 61% diversion rate countywide. According to the calculations provided by the CIWMB, for calendar year 2005, Sonoma County generated 1,248,480 total tons of which 78,211.38 tons (61%) were diverted and 520,581 total tons (49%) were landfilled in permitted disposal facilities in California.</p> <p>AB 939 requires a 50% diversion from landfill. The Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan adopted by all jurisdictions in 2003 recommends a 70% diversion by 2015.</p> <p>2006 and 2007 diversion rates have not been calculated or submitted to the CIWMB. Annual reports are usually due to the CIWMB 18 months after the end of the reporting year. Staff is waiting for the electronic submittal instructions from the CIWMB for the 2006 calendar year which is needed to estimate the diversion rate.</p>

120.	What role does the Proposer play in the management of the County’s diversion effort and are these diversion programs part of the services to be provided by the RFQ respondents?	The role the Proposer will play in the management of the diversion effort and provision of diversion services is an issue that will be addressed in detail in the industry review and RFP phase and shortlisted Proposers will be encouraged to provide input on this topic. See also answer to Question # 56.
121.	To where will the composting facility now located at Landfill 1 be relocated in order to accommodate the expansion capacity of Landfill 1?	The Sonoma County Waste Management Agency is in the middle of a compost program siting study at this time.
122.	The total permitted capacity of the five (5) in-County transfer stations is approximately 870,000 TPY (at 6 days/week operation). This is more than enough to handle the project 450,000 TPY non-diverted waste stream projected for the year 2025 (RFQ Page A.9). Is there any requirement to keep any or all of the transfer stations open following divestiture.	It is premature to answer this question. It is a topic that will be addressed during industry review and in the RFP phase and the County will be interested in receiving shortlisted Proposer input on this topic.
123.	On RFQ Page C-3 it is stated “Construction of a compressed natural gas (CNG) fueling station was initiated in early December 2006.” and that completion is expected in late 2007. Since both the electricity generating plant and CNG fueling station will use landfill gas, and 2,800 SCFM is currently collected from the Central Landfill disposal site, how will the landfill gas be budgeted or allocated to each function in the future?	The CNG project is only a pilot project at this time. As a result, no allocation has been established. The plan was to meet electric energy sales obligations as a first priority and then use excess gas for the CNG project if a final project is found to be feasible.
124.	Please clarify what (if any) buildings (administration, maintenance), utilities, rolling stock and ancillary assets (fences, water supply/wastewater system) at each of the Assets would be part of the Divestiture.	See answer to Question #32 The County anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted proposers.
125.	Please provide a complete list of all aboveground and underground gasoline/diesel and waste oil storage tanks located at each of the Asset sites, including their size, design, and in-service dates.	With the exception of one underground oil/water separator at the Central site, the County is not aware of any underground storage tanks at any of the Asset sites.  Above ground fuel tanks at the Annapolis, Guerneville,

		<p>Healdsburg and Sonoma are owned and operated by the contract operator.</p> <p>Oil Recycling Tanks are all 480 gallons and are located at each Transfer Station including Central and are owned by the County.</p> <p>More detailed information can be provided to shortlisted Proposers during industry review and the RFP phase.</p>
126.	<p>Is the County going to negotiate agreements with the Cities for commitments of tonnage to the in-county transfer stations, especially in light of (1) the Brown Vence &amp; Associates (BVA) report noting, “at least 80% [of the] disposal system participation is needed to cover the high fixed costs and capital expenditures required” and (2) the statement on RFQ Page A-9 that “There are presently no contractual commitments from the remaining eight cities for disposal of its solid waste using the Assets”?</p>	<p>See answer to Question #93. As noted in the RFQ, there are currently no flow control commitments with the cities. To date, those 8 cities have made the policy decision to stay within the County solid waste system. As previously noted, the County has initiated discussions with the cities regarding their potential participation in the divestiture process.</p>
127.	<p>The BVA report goes on to note “...Even if 80% participation is achieved, regulatory acceptance on a long-term basis will continue to be a major risk in County disposal.” It also says, “other jurisdictions have indicated they are looking at their disposal options which may or may not include the use of the [County] disposal system.”</p> <p>What steps will be taken by the County to insure that current tonnages continue to flow to the transfer station(s) after the sale, and that more municipalities do not back out of the system as Petaluma did?</p>	<p>See answer to Question #126.</p>
128.	<p>What other jurisdictions are currently looking at other disposal options in lieu of using the Assets?</p>	<p>The County is not aware of any such plans. See answer to Question # 100.</p>
129.	<p>The BVA Final Report, dated January 2006, on Pages E-12 through E-14 presents the economic analyses of four Economic Scenarios, including total cost estimates</p>	<p>Additional materials of this nature, to the extent in the County’s possession, will be made available following</p>

	<p>and estimated tipping fees over the 20-year analysis period. It would greatly increase the RFQ respondents' ability to understand and analyze the underlying capital, operation, and other costs assumptions if this model were provided electronically.</p> <p>Please provide in electronic format each of the engineering and financial models used to develop the total cost and tip fee estimates, and the underlying assumptions used to formulate the data.</p>	<p>shortlisting and during industry review.</p>
130.	<p>Does the County plan to regulate tipping fees?</p>	<p>It is premature to answer this question. It is a topic that will be addressed during industry review and in the RFP phase and the County will be interested receiving shortlisted Proposer input on this topic.</p>
131.	<p>Currently the County provides labor and equipment to operate the Central Transfer Station and labor for the cashier operations at the four other transfer stations, and the four other transfer stations are operated by West Sonoma County Disposal. We estimate, from the County's Department of Public Works (DPW) 2007-2008 budget of fifty-two (52) people, that it employs over forty-two (42) full time professional and hourly personnel plus ten (10) "engineering technicians" at the landfills and transfer stations. The "engineering technicians" supervise the maintenance and operation of the gas and leachate systems; perform monitoring, reporting and permit functions; and manage capital projects and post closure maintenance of seven closed landfills in the County that are not included in the divestiture.</p> <p>Does the County contemplate discontinuance of direct employment of any or all of these personnel if and when a new owner / operator takes over operations of the transfer stations and/or landfills?</p>	<p>Whether the County contemplates discontinuance of direct employment of any or all of these personnel if and when a new owner / operator takes over operations of the Assets is an issue that will be addressed in detail in the industry review and RFP phase and shortlisted Proposers will be encouraged to provide input on this topic.</p>
132.	<p>If any of the above personnel are to be retained under County employment will the County expect compensation from the new owner for those personnel?</p>	<p>This is an issue that can be explored further during the industry review process. At this point, it would not be the County's intent to do so, except to the extent that the County performs services for the Purchaser relating to the Assets after the divestiture.</p>

133.	How does the County plan to allow such employment expenses to be in the new owner's cost recovery program?	See answer to Question #132.
134.	Can the County provide to Proposers, prior to the submittal of Statements of Qualifications, an organizational chart, including job titles and position descriptions, for the staff at each of the assets the County intends to retain, along with a list of equipment that the County intends to retain or divest as part of the sale?	An organizational chart will be added to the data room. See Question #32 re: equipment and Question #s 131-133 re: employees.
135.	Since the other four outlying transfer stations are operated by the West Sonoma County Disposal under the terms of an operations agreement that expires in August 2010, can this operations agreement be assigned from the County to the successful Proposer prior to that date?	See answer to Question #57.
136.	What is the most recent engineering fill sequence plan for the Landfill 1 and Landfill 2 remaining capacity, as well as the engineering estimate for the future methane production amounts over time?	The County anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted proposers.
137.	Does the County intend to transfer the operation and management of the electric generating facility at the Central Landfill to a new owner?	The landfill gas recovery facility is currently among the Assets being offered for divestiture; however, it is premature to answer this question. It is a topic that will be addressed during industry review and in the RFP phase and the County will be interested in receiving shortlisted Proposer input on this topic.
138.	If the County does so intend, does the County expect to be remunerated for such transfer and for future energy sales?	See answer to Question #137.
139.	Who is the current contract operator of the electric generation facility and flare?	See Michigan Cogeneration agreements under contract documents in the data room.
140.	Please provide a list of the known capital repairs that will be needed in the near future, related to the transfer	The County anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and

	stations, beyond the next year's budget plans listed in the RFQ?	RFP phase to the shortlisted proposers.
141.	What is the status of the leachate treatment plant?	The mercury treatment plant (pre-treatment) is not in operation at this time. No pre-treatment is currently required by the Santa Rosa Waste Water Treatment Plant.
142.	The Hammel Road Property is currently used as a wetland and red-legged frog mitigation site, and that the mitigations were required under the environmental documents and permits for the Landfill 2 development.  Please confirm that the Hammel Road mitigation area is part of the Divestiture.	The Hammel Road mitigation area <u>is</u> part of the Assets.
143.	Please provide copies of the relevant excerpts of these environmental documents and permits or provide a clear cross-reference to the documents in the "data room".	Some of these documents are available in the data room. The County anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted proposers.
144.	It is understood from the documents provided that a lot of work has been performed for the Wetlands Mitigation area.  Has the County prepared a recent cost estimate that identifies the future expenses associated with the Wetland Mitigation Area? If so, please provide the documentation.	The County has not prepared such a cost estimate.
145.	What are the specific operation and maintenance activities that the County conducts to maintain this mitigation program, including long-term maintenance and monitoring?	The County anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted proposers.
146.	How many work hours annually and what technical specialists are involved in maintaining this mitigation program?	See answer to Question #143.
147.	Is the County willing to accept a proposal that anticipates not renewing or re-permitting the capacity for the Landfill 1, Landfill 2, and the West Canyon	At this point the County is open to any reasonable proposals related to the Assets; however, it would be premature to answer

	expansion area?	this question. It is a topic that will be addressed during industry review and in the RFP phase and the County will be interested in receiving shortlisted Proposer input on this topic. Reference should also be made to <u>Part A, Section 2.2</u> , which outlines the County's preliminary goals.
148.	<p>The CIWMB permit addresses the remaining capacity of the permitted 172.8 acres, for both Landfill 1 and Landfill 2. It also notes that there are 22.8 acres of Landfill 2 area that are not currently permitted (allowed) to be filled by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).</p> <p>Please confirm the County's understanding that only the referenced WDR from the RWQCB is needed to allow development of that 22.8 acres of Landfill 2, and that no further CIWMB review of approval is needed for that 22.8 acres or for the remaining 4 million cubic yards in the 2 area of Landfill 1.</p>	<p>This is the County's understanding with respect to the 22.8 acres in Landfill 2.</p> <p>There is no area 2 of Landfill 1.</p>
149.	<p>Under the Purchasers Permitting Obligations section of the RFQ, the County states, "in no event shall the County limit or modify its police power and sovereign authority to issue, renew, or approve any future County issued permits."</p> <p>Is the County willing to restrict this authority only if related to operating in non-compliance with current regulations, laws or ordinances, or in an unsafe manner determined by OSHA standards?</p>	<p>By law, the County cannot abdicate or restrict its police, regulatory and permitting power. However, subject to that limitation, the County may be willing to consider cooperation with the purchaser concerning re-permitting and expansion permitting activities.</p>
150.	<p>Why has the County not proceeded to begin the CEQA and permit process already, in regard to the West Canyon expansion area, especially in light of the conditions surrounding Landfill 1 and Landfill 2 not being able to accept any more waste since October 2005?</p>	<p>The County chose to hire BVA to study all of the County's long-term disposal options prior to proceeding with any major new investments at the Central Landfill.</p>
151.	<p>If the County has begun the CEQA and permit process in regard to the West Canyon expansion area, has the County performed a permitting feasibility assessment?</p>	<p>See answer to Question #68.</p>
		<p>No. See answer to Question #</p>

152.	<p>The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance (an Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration) has not been completed for the West Canyon expansion area.</p> <p>Have there been any preliminary CEQA-type studies associated with the West Canyon expansion area as it relates to potential traffic congestion, noise, etc. in the area? If so, please provide the documentation.</p>	40.
153.	<p>What are the key challenges and opposition to the permit process for the West Canyon expansion area?</p>	<p>The key challenges are consistent with what they would be with any major landfill expansion proposal in the State. Regarding opposition, see answer to Question # 42.</p>
154.	<p>The County currently holds Waste Discharge Orders R1-2004-0040 (WDRs) from the RWQCB that allow for filling to occur and the RWQCB is taking the position that new WDRs would be needed before proceeding with an expansion of the Central Landfill.</p> <p>What, specifically, needs to be revised in the WDRs, and what is the estimated time for getting these revisions implemented?</p>	<p>WDR revisions and implementation are subject to negotiations with the RWQCB. Based on discussions to date with the RWQCB, the County understands that a new owner/operator will need to submit a revised engineered alternative design for a liner to the Regional Board and receive approval for such design. This is an issue that will be addressed in detail in the industry review and RFP phase and shortlisted proposers will be encouraged to provide input on this topic.</p>
155.	<p>Why has the County not proceeded in applying for and securing the new allowable Waste Discharge Orders (WDRs) for the remaining 22.8 acres of Landfill 2 and the remaining capacity of Landfill 1?</p>	<p>See answer to Question #150.</p>
156.	<p>Does the statement on RFQ Page A-10 that “Following any divestiture of the Assets, all permitting activities, including obtaining, maintaining, and renewing environmental, operations, and solid waste permits, shall be the sole responsibility of the Purchaser” mean that the County will not work with the Purchaser on any future CEQA development efforts in support of the West Canyon expansion or also work with the Purchaser in its efforts to obtain the Landfill 1 and Landfill 2 WDR(s)?</p>	<p>No, that interpretation is not correct. See answer to Question #149.</p>

157.	<p>According to line Item 8 on Page 2 of the 2004 WDRs, additional demonstrations must be provided in order to resume placement in the Landfill 1 area.</p> <p>Have the demonstrations been made? If so, please provide this documentation.</p>	<p>No, the demonstrations have not been made. The County, however, has worked with the Regional Board to gain an improved understanding regarding the distribution and occurrence of leachate in Landfill 1 and the effectiveness of the leachate collection and removal system in controlling leachate migration.</p>
158.	<p>Regarding CIWMB Litigation in the Data File, on Page 8 of the petition it is indicated that the CIWMB has upheld that the Central Landfill has less than 2 years of permitted capacity left.</p> <p>Why haven't closure activities commenced at the Central Landfill if it has repeat violations, can no longer accept waste, and is not economically feasible to continue to accept waste?</p>	<p>See answer to Question #12.</p>
159.	<p>What is the purpose of recording covenants, conditions and restrictions on all Asset real property purchased that will prohibit any use for non-solid waste activities if those activities would be allowed under state closure regulations?</p>	<p>The general purpose of CC&amp;Rs is to (i) ensure that post-closure land uses are consistent with the historical use as solid waste assets; and (ii) reduce and mitigate potential County (and purchaser) environmental exposure in the future associated with post-closure land uses (such as putting a school on a closed landfill site).</p>
160.	<p>Given that the RWQCB has stated that new WDRs will be necessary for any expansion of the remaining capacity at Landfill 1 and Phases III through V of Landfill 2 (and West Canyon expansion area), have they communicated the type of containment system, such as a double composite system, they would require for any future expansion in these areas? If so, please provide the correspondence.</p>	<p>No approval of a revised containment system has been approved in writing by the RWQCB.</p> <p>See answer to Question # 154.</p>
161.	<p>The RFQ states that there are approximately 9 million cy of airspace remaining in the existing permitted landfill (Landfill 1 and Landfill 2) not including the West Canyon expansion area's additional capacity of 25 million cy. The Facility/Site Summary Details (last</p>	<p>Our current SWFP, issued by the CIWMB on 9-2-2005, states a design capacity of 32,650,000 cu yds. The County cannot explain this discrepancy. The information on the CIWMB data</p>

	<p>updated in September 2005) from the CIWMB states that the remaining capacity is just over 11.2 million cy with a maximum capacity of about 19.8 million cy.</p> <p>Can the County clarify the discrepancy in these values?</p>	<p>base appears to be in error.</p>
162.	<p>Under line Item 15 (Compliance Schedule) Page 25 of the WDR RF2004-0040 provided in the data room, there is a long list of work plans and compliance items within this schedule. Please provide a summary of the status on each of these items and the associated documentation regarding each.</p>	<p>The County anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted Proposers.</p>
163.	<p>On RFQ Page A-10 it is stated that the analysis of the use and capacity for Landfill 2 are included in a certified EIR. The RFQ goes on to state that the North Coast Regional WQCB has taken the position that new WDR's would be needed that include a revised liner construction design.</p> <p>The RFQ "data room" does not include the certified EIR for Landfill 2 use and capacity. A copy of this EIR is requested.</p>	<p>The County anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted Proposers.</p>
164.	<p>Under line Item 15 of the WDR RI 2004-0040 Provisions (Compliance Schedule) Page 25 provided in the data room, what is specifically meant in the Corrective Action Requirement related to the "<i>Complete Leachate Removal...</i>" which has a deadline of August 15, 2009?</p>	<p>The County anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted Proposers.</p>
165.	<p>Please provide a copy of the RFQ Page A-11-referenced July 23, 2007 CIWMB letter and relevant RWQCB correspondence on the permitting requirements for Landfill 2 and West Canyon expansion area.</p>	<p>See Exhibit J to the Complaint which is in the data room for a copy of the July 23, 2007 letter. As to the rest of the request, the County anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted proposers.</p> <p>Based on discussions to date with the Regional Board, the County understands that a future owner/operator will need to submit a revised engineered alternative design for a liner to the Regional Board and receive</p>

		<p>approval for such engineered alternative design.</p> <p>The Regional Board has verbally indicated to County staff that the limitation in the current WDR with respect to Landfill 1 and 2 should have no impact on the West Canyon Expansion as it is physically separate from Landfill 1 and 2.</p>
166.	Does the RWQCB (or other agency) hold that a new EIR will be needed before Landfill 2 can be used?	The County is not aware of any such holding.
167.	<p>On RFQ Page A-11 it is stated, “There are no known significant environmental issues associated with the Transfer Stations.”</p> <p>Due to the environmental/permitting complexity of the Assets, we request a compliance summary table that lists, for all facilities for at least the past five years, any and all formal enforcement actions including warning letters, notices of violation, fines and penalties, corrective actions, and current status.</p>	The County anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted Proposers.
168.	<p>On RFQ Page A-11 it is stated “Proposers may be permitted to conduct limited non-invasive environmental site assessments of the Assets during the RFP stage”.</p> <p>Please confirm that either the County will conduct and provide the results of full Phase I and Phase II assessments as part of the RFP, or that Proposers may conduct Phase I and Phase II assessment prior to the submission of final priced proposals</p>	The County will make additional information concerning the Assets available following shortlisting and during industry review and in the RFP phase. However, the County does not anticipate that it will develop new materials, studies or reports and that the due diligence deemed necessary by the shortlisted Proposers will be undertaken by them prior to submittal of Proposals. Site access and what physical due diligence activities may be undertaken will be discussed during industry review.
169.	<p>On RFQ Page A-12 it is stated that “... false positive detections” resulted, “based on the spatial distribution of the monitored media in wells upgradient as compared to downgradient for the site.”</p> <p>Please provide a map showing these wells relative to</p>	The County anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted Proposers.

	relevant local groundwater flow/hydrogeologic information.	
170.	<p>All twenty (20) acres of liner in Landfill 2 were put into place under the same WDR.</p> <p>Because there has already been one breach in this liner system, what assurances are there that there will not be a second or third breach in this same liner system somewhere else in the twenty acres?</p>	<p>The breaches occurred when the liner was exposed to equipment. All of the liner in Landfill 2 is now covered with an average of 50 feet of compacted refuse, therefore, no future breaches are expected.</p>
171.	<p>Because of the liner damage in Landfill 2 (Phase I and II) that has caused groundwater contamination, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) has stated in Item 9 on page 2 of the 2004 WDRs that a new Report of Waste Discharge (RWD)/Joint Technical Document (JTD) must be prepared in order to expand into the Phase III and IV area.</p> <p>Were the known damaged areas of the liner system in the Landfill 2 area repaired found acceptable by the regulating agencies per the compliance schedule? If so, please provide the documentation.</p>	<p>All known damaged liner has been repaired. The County anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted proposers.</p>
172.	<p>Are there continuing problems related to these damaged liner areas such as elevated contamination in the groundwater? If so, please provide the documentation.</p>	<p>See the answer to Question #104.</p>
173.	<p>Are there other environmental issues related to the damaged liner, such as gas migration under the liner system?</p> <p>If so, have those issues been corrected?</p>	<p>See answer to Question #171.</p>
174.	<p>If those issues have not been corrected, is there an approved work plan and/or estimate of the cost to resolve those issues? Please provide the documentation.</p>	<p>See answer to Question #171.</p>
175.	<p>Has the RWQCB, California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB), Air Quality District (AQD) or Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) discussed any new operational issues related to the liner damage or other problems at the site that they would like to see</p>	<p>The County anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted proposers.</p>

	addressed in the new RWD/JTD? If so, please provide the correspondence.	
176.	<p>On Page A-11 of the RFQ, Section 2.5.2 states “Constituents discovered in the groundwater underdrain were traced to a breach in the liner...”. Within the extensive library of background information provided by the County as part of the RFQ we could not locate the data that the above RFQ statement addresses.</p> <p>Please provide to Proposers either (1) the data that the above RFQ statement addresses or (2) a clear cross-reference to the specific data, to clarify what constituents of concern were found and in what concentration?</p>	See answer to Question #104.
177.	Because the County has a Pledge of Revenue for post closure and corrective action requirements, and because private companies can not use the Pledge of Revenue mechanism, and because Landfill 1 and Landfill 2 have only nine (9) million cubic yards of remaining capacity out of the 32.6 million cubic yards design capacity, does the County plan to fund this past obligation into a trust account prior to the sale of the Asset to the amount approved by the State of California IWMB based on capacity utilization thus far?	It is premature to answer this question. It is a topic that will be addressed during industry review and in the RFP phase and the County will be interested in receiving shortlisted Proposer input on this topic. The County is open to all reasonable proposals in respect to the issue.
178.	Is the amount funded into the Central Landfill Closure Fund, established by the Auditor-Controller of Sonoma County for closure, determined to be adequate by the CIWMB based on capacity utilization thus far if transferred into a trust account?	The CIWMB has indicated that it intends to address the adequacy of the Central Landfill closure cost fund following the anticipated resolution of the Stipulated Notice and Order related to future submittal of final closure and post-closure documentation which is currently being negotiated by the County and the LEA/CIWMB.
179.	If the above amount is not adequate, does the County plan to fund this past obligation requirement into a trust account accessible to the Proposer under regulatory guidelines prior to the sale of the Asset, to the amount approved by the CIWMB?	See answer to Question #177. It is premature to answer this question. It is a topic that will be addressed during industry review and in the RFP phase and the County will be interested in receiving shortlisted Proposer input on this topic.

180.	<p>The RFQ states that an Enterprise Fund is being used to fund closure activities and that a Pledge of Revenue is being used to fund post closure activities. However, per regulation, if an owner/operator fails to perform closure activities, the CIWMB may direct the controller to pay for closure activities from the Pledge of Revenue.</p> <p>Because the CIWMB has directed the County to begin closure activities, and because it appears that the County has not yet done so, has the CIWMB directed the controller to begin paying from the Pledge of Revenue post-closure fund?</p>	<p>Presently, the County and the LEA/CIWMB are negotiating a Stipulated Notice and Order regarding future submittal of final closure and post-closure documentation. There has been no requirement to commence closure activities at this time. Accordingly, there has been no direction to begin paying funds from the existing closure fund account.</p>
181.	<p>The RFQ indicates that the amount of pledged revenue will be equal to \$65,578 per year for the 30-year post closure period. However, the regulation for post closure maintenance is "... for 30 years or until the waste no longer poses a threat to human health and the environment."</p> <p>Will the County protect the purchaser for funding should post closure maintenance period be required to be funded beyond the required 30 years? This is especially important because there are a multitude of significant environmental problems occurring at the Central Landfill.</p>	<p>Your observation is noted. This topic can be addressed during industry review and in the RFP phase and the County will be interested in receiving further shortlisted Proposer input on this topic.</p>
182.	<p>Can copies of the closure and post closure estimates be provided to Proposers prior to the submittal of Statements of Qualifications, particularly the initial cost estimate worksheets which calculate the closure at approximately \$47 million and the post closure at approximately \$67 million in today's inflated dollars?</p>	<p>See additional information on this topic which has been added to the data room. In addition, the County anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted proposers.</p>
183.	<p>Can a copy of the most recent statement that indicates the balance in the Central Landfill Closure Fund set aside by Auditor-Controller for Sonoma County be provided to Proposers prior to the submittal of Statements of Qualifications?</p>	<p>See additional information on this topic which has been added to the data room. In addition, the County anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted proposers.</p>
184.	<p>Does the Closure / Post-Closure cost estimate include</p>	<p>No.</p>

	the West Canyon expansion area? If so, please provide the documentation.	
185.	Please provide the documentation that derives the most current cost estimate for Corrective Action of approximately \$2.4 million?	The County anticipates providing additional information on this topic in the industry review and RFP phase to the shortlisted proposers.
186.	Can the County explain the apparent discrepancy between (1) the Pledge of Revenue agreement, which indicates in Item 3 an amount of \$65,578 pledged for 30 years for post-closure maintenance (Total \$1,967,340), and (2) the \$69,527,126 estimated for post-closure on the Annual Inflation Factor 2006 form filed with the State for the Central Landfill?	The pledge of revenue agreement is from 2000 and has been adjusted for inflation annually since that time.
187.	As stated in the RFQ, the West Canyon expansion area would involve excavation of 19 mcy of soil including a large quantity of highly marketable rock material.  Does the County have documentation on the market value of the rock material that remains to be excavated? If so, please provide this documentation.	The County does not have a market value estimate of the rock within the West Expansion area.
188.	Given the high quantity of rock removal necessary, will there be any County limitations regarding the sale of this rock and does the County expect to receive any proceeds from the aggregate sale? If so, please provide the documentation.	It is premature to answer this question. It is a topic that will be addressed during industry review and in the RFP phase and the County will be interested in receiving shortlisted Proposer input on this topic. See answers to Questions # 41 and 68.
189.	Because of the large amount of rock to be excavated, it appears that additional land for stockpiling, rock handling, etc. may be necessary in the vicinity of the West Canyon expansion area.  Has the County communicated with the nearby residences and neighbors regarding this project and inquired about the purchase of additional lands? If so, please provide the correspondence to and from these neighbors?	The County has not had formal conversations with neighbors regarding the purchase of property associated with the expansion of the West Canyon area.
190.	On Page A-3 the RFQ refers to an "... overall scarcity of marketable rock material ..." in the County, states	See answer to Questions #9 and 10.

	<p>that the expansion of the West Canyon area "... would involve the excavation of 19 million cubic yards of native soils and highly marketable rock material", and refers the reader to the related Blue Rock Quarry draft EIR.</p> <p>Can the County provide to Proposers site-specific data on (1) soils/geologic evaluation that clarifies the type of rock and soil, and on (2) grain size distribution and permeability of the referenced native soils (e.g. data in cm/sec), to the extent that it is available, so that the adequacy of this material for intermediate and final cover can be evaluated?</p>	
191.	<p>Has a recent cost estimate been prepared which defines the anticipated costs to construct (including soil and rock excavation) in the West Canyon expansion area? If so, please provide the documentation.</p>	See answer to Question #17.
192.	<p>Currently, the 2005 SWFP allows very restricted blasting for the current permitted landfill. Does the County foresee any additional restrictions with blasting in the West Canyon expansion area? If so, please provide the documentation.</p>	Since the CEQA documentation for the West Expansion area has not been done, the answer to this question is unknown.
193.	<p>In RFQ Section 6.3.1 reference is made to RFQ Part B, Statement of Qualifications Volume 1, Sections 1.10, 1.10.1, 1.10.2, and 1.10.3. SOQ Volume 1 does not include Sections so numbered.</p> <p>Please clarify this discrepancy.</p>	The reference is incorrect. The correct reference is to <u>Part B, Volume 1, Sections 1.9, 1.9.1, 1.9.2 and 1.9.3</u> . See Addendum #1.
194.	<p>In RFQ Section 6.3.2 reference is made to the Approach to Divestiture as being Statement of Qualifications Volume 2, Section 2. It appears that the intended reference should be Volume 1, Section 2.</p> <p>Please clarify this discrepancy.</p>	You are correct. See Addendum #1.
195.	<p>Why is it necessary to provide a non-binding Asset valuation range in the RFQ, especially given eight (8) different divestiture scenarios, without Proposer's completion of a responsible due diligence effort, if a Proposer can show in its Statement of Qualifications that it has the financial wherewithal to provide funding</p>	With respect to the non-binding Asset valuations, see answer to Question #23. With respect to why the County is asking for information concerning "(1) how the County can maximize value of its current operations, as well

	<p>resources for a future RFP valuation response? In addition, why is such a detailed level of response required, related to (1) how the County can maximize value of its current operations, future expansion, and general approach to operations, as well to (2) how to proceed with re-permitting Landfill 1 and Landfill 2, and permitting West Canyon expansion area, if the Proposer can demonstrate it has sufficient past experience and the resources to meet the County requirements? Wouldn't this detailed level of response be best applied to the RFP process?</p>	<p>(2) how to proceed with re-permitting Landfill 1 and Landfill 2, and permitting West Canyon expansion area," the County believes that such information is not only useful as inputs to the County's policy decisions and development of draft RFP and purchase documents, but also presents an opportunity for a Proposer to show that they will be a strong competitor in the RFP Phase, and, if they are ultimately selected as the successful Proposer, there will be a strong chance of closing the divestiture transaction and achieving the County's goals.</p>
196.	<p>What is the reasoning behind restricting Proposers from contacting public (state and local) agencies so that Proposers can perform a thorough evaluation and due diligence related to (1) the assets contemplated for sale and (2) assessment of the Proposers' underlying risk of achieving the County's stated purpose?</p>	<p>The County wants to maximize the fairness of the divestiture process and is attempting to ensure that Proposers receive equitable and equivalent access to information. At the same time, the County is concerned that the public agencies potentially involved in the process are not overwhelmed with information requests during the RFQ stage. The County has made available the information it believes is relevant for purposes of responding to the RFQ. During the industry review process and in the RFP stage, the issue of contact with other public agencies will be discussed and the County may facilitate such access. The County desires that Proposers have access to all reasonably necessary information relevant to their Proposals to acquire the Assets; however, it also believes that it is important for the reasons outlined above, that there be some structure and control over the process. See Addendum #1.</p>
197.	<p>To facilitate a more responsive response to the RFQ,</p>	<p>See answer to Question #25.</p>

	can the County schedule a walk-through of each of the Assets by Proposers prior to submittal of the RFQ response?	
198.	<p>In view of (1) the depth and breadth of detail required to be incorporated in responses to the County's RFQ, and (2) the approaching holiday season, is the County willing to extend the deadline for submittal of responses to the RFQ, allowing responders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate time to review and evaluate the extensive documentation provided, as well as</li> <li>• Additional time to absorb the County's issuance of responses to questions and as-needed addenda, currently scheduled for December 11, 2007</li> </ul> <p>so that Proposers can develop better Statements of Qualifications that are responsive to the County's requirements?</p>	See answer to Question #91.
199.	Can an entity submit a bid for the landfill gas/energy generating station at Central Landfill only?	See answer to Question #102. However, it is unlikely that the County will only divest the landfill gas/energy generating station at the Central Landfill by itself through this divestiture process. Should the County wish to divest this system individually, it will likely be pursuant to a different process.