



**COUNTY OF DANE**  
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION  
**PURCHASING DIVISION**

Room 425 City-County Building  
210 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.  
Madison, WI 53703-3345  
608/266-4131

FAX 608/266-4425 TDD 608/266-4941

BONNIE HAMMERSLEY  
Director of Administration

CHARLES HICKLIN  
Controller

DATE: November 10, 2006

TO: All Prospective Bidders/Proposers

SUBJECT: **ADDENDUM #1**  
RFP #106125  
Dane County Manure Management Feasibility Study

The following addendum becomes a part of the RFP/BID. All other terms and conditions of Bid /RFP remain in effect, unchanged.

The following is a listing of answers to questions received prior to the on-site/vendor conference. The listing and was passed out to vendors attending the on-site visit / conference.

1	Questions	What is the amount of money available for this study?
	Answer:	The County budget has \$100,000 available for all of its work on evaluating alternatives for improved manure management. The County is aware of outside financial assistance for manure management feasibility studies for which it may be eligible, which would increase the availability of funding. In addition, the County is willing to negotiate the scope of work with its vendor to stay within its available financial resources.
2	Question:	Will the County be making in-progress payments to the vendor?
	Answer:	Yes, the County will provide in-progress payments, with the schedule and milestones to be determined during negotiation.
3	Question:	Will the County make available copies of the study of anaerobic digestion that was done in 2003?
	Answer:	This study was done for Madison Gas & Electric and copies can be obtained from them as described in section 1.1 and Appendix H. The County will not be a distributor of the study.
4	Question:	For anaerobic digestion, could materials other than manure be digested?

	Answer:	Yes, as noted in the list of issues on page 6, in section 5.4, and the resolution which lead to this project (see Appendix F), food and other substrates should be examined.
5	Question:	Would proposals be accepted from faculty or staff in an academic department, or does a "firm" mean only a private sector entity?
	Answer:	We would welcome proposals that meet our criteria from any entity or individual.
6	Question:	Can you please prioritize the issues that are listed as they relate to the scope of work? Not all technologies will address all of the listed issues and by prioritizing the issues, an appropriate evaluation can be made.
	Answer:	There is no priority to the issues listed on pages 6 and 7 of the RFP. It is not expected that all technologies will address all of the issues; instead, these issues should be considered during the evaluation of alternative manure management systems.
7	Question:	Can you please clarify what you mean about the Greenhouse Gas credits and their ownership?
	Answer:	Markets have been established for the sale of greenhouse gas credits. In some cases, the buyers of energy from anaerobic digestion systems also buy the right to sell these credits; in other cases, the producer of the energy retains the right to sell these credits.
8	Question:	What is the current \$/kwh in the region?
	Answer:	The prices for the sale of electricity to users and the buy-back rates from the utility are to be determined by the vendor as part of the feasibility study.
9	Question:	In regards to the comparison of existing costs to costs of alternatives, will the information on the farms be provided by the County or will we be required to obtain this information?
	Answer:	The vendor will need to develop this information as part of the study, as described in section 5.5. A template for the calculation of current manure management costs for this project is under development at the University of Wisconsin, and is expected to be finished this year, before the project begins.
10	Question:	There are 50,000 dairy cows in the county, what is the associated number of replacement animals in inventory?  There are 20,000 swine in the county, are these total head or can

		<p>you provide a breakdown of sows, weaners, and feeders?</p> <p>Can you provide us with a list of other livestock species in the county as well as animal numbers and breakdown of age groups?</p>
	Answer:	<p>The number of dairy and swine animals in the County was provided in the RFP as background information. The feasibility study will be directed at the actual number of animals of the farms selected to be studied.</p>
11	Question:	<p>A survey is to be completed for the Upper Lake Mendota watershed, can you define its extent? Based on a GIS review of the watersheds, it seems like a smaller area than approximately 350 farms. Do you mean to include Six Mile and Pheasant Branch Creeks, Yahara River and Lake Mendota, or any others?</p>
	Answer:	<p>Yes, the watershed includes the two areas listed in the question and they can be seen on a map on the Internet at <a href="http://www.danewaters.com/resource/WatershedMap.aspx">http://www.danewaters.com/resource/WatershedMap.aspx</a>.</p> <p>For the purposes of submitting a proposal, the proposer should use the estimate of 350 farms in the study area. More recent data suggest that the number may be less than half of this, and we are compiling a mailing list to be available before the project begins.</p>
12	Question:	<p>If we have significant experience with farms in this region, can we select a group or groups of farms that would meet your goals, instead of completing the survey?</p>
	Answer:	<p>The proposal is to include the survey; the proposer is also able to propose alternatives, and provide sufficient detail to allow the County to evaluate the efficacy of the alternatives.</p>
13	Question:	<p>If the survey is mandatory, what happens if we cannot get a 25% rate of return?</p>
	Answer:	<p>The County will be flexible on this issue. It is recommended that the survey be attempted in one or two rounds via mail and, if this does not produce sufficient results, one round of phone calls. Additional effort will not be expected.</p>
14	Question:	<p>Is a contact list going to be supplied of the 350 farms? If not, what methods are available to obtain this information?</p>
	Answer:	<p>This list is not currently available. The County is working to produce this list prior to the start of the project by contacting the local electric utilities, farming organizations and state agencies that work with farmers. We will prepare this in an electronic format.</p>

15	Question:	The selection of farms to be used for analysis calls for one to three clusters of 2 to 5 farms for analysis. Can you be specific if it is 1, 2, or 3 clusters, as it will impact the costs associated with the project? Can you be specific on the number of farms as well, as it also has an impact on the project costs?
	Answer:	The proposer should include costs estimates for each of these three options of 1, 2 or 3 clusters. The scope of work and payment will be based on both contract negotiation and work progress.
16	Question:	In description of by-products in section 5.4 of the RFP, you list "other" on a number of categories, can you be more specific?
	Answer:	The County has listed the by-products that it is aware of and believes have significant potential. The proposer may know of other by-products that it believes have significant potential. We encourage proposers to build upon their experience and expertise to suggest other markets.
17	Question:	In Section 5.4, you indicate that a list of potential substrates and their producers within and near Dane County is being compiled by the County. When will this information be supplied, and will it contain quantities, seasonality, description of moisture content and other physical properties related to the potential substrates?
	Answer:	We will provide a list of potential substrates and their producers to the selected vendor. At the current time, the County is only aware of two such producers. The vendor will be responsible for contacting the producers to obtain the necessary information. It should be also noted that the County is not expected detailed analyses of substrates in this feasibility study; as noted, the costs and system descriptions for the alternatives to be examined are <i>pro forma</i> information.
18	Question:	A calculation of 10 and 20 mile one-way hauls to a community facility are asked for but would an alternative approach also be allowed in order to determine the best location for the system in the county? This approach would consider locations throughout the entire county instead of only the Upper Lake Mendota watershed.
	Answer:	Locations other than the Lake Mendota Watershed can be considered for the facility. However, it will still be necessary to do the calculations for the 10 and 20 mile one-way hauls.
19	Question:	Can you please clarify Section 5.8 - <i>Other non-monetary issues</i> . What are you looking for?
	Answer:	Dane County has listed the major issues that it has identified based on a review of an extensive number of feasibility studies, tours of livestock farms with alternative manure management systems and

		other sources of information. However, the proposer may have other issues that it is aware of, based on the proposer's experience and expertise, and other issues may be raised during the feasibility study. If these other issues are deemed significant, they should be addressed in the feasibility study.
20	Question:	Are we required to review some of the unproven novel by-product utilizations or can we focus on the mainstream alternatives?
	Answer:	The proposer is invited to indicate which by-products it will examine. It will not be required to review unproven novel by-products that do not appear to have any significant potential.
21	Question:	Can you explain "sonication" in regards to the supporting information?
	Answer:	According the Biology-Online.org dictionary, sonication is "The process of disrupting biologic materials by use of sound wave energy." Sonication is used to speed up the anaerobic digestion of organic wastewaters, and is being researched for its application for manure, including work funded by the Wisconsin Focus on Energy program. It was also addressed in the 2003 study done of farms in Dane County for MGE.
22	Question:	Is this system meant to be used year-round or only during times of the year when farms' manure system capacities are stressed and negative environmental impacts from manure spreading can occur?
	Answer:	The design should be based on year-round use.
23	Question:	Can you clarify the "Mandatory Requirements" item that appears in the list of required sections under 2.5, Proposal Organization and Format in the RFP? It's listed, but there is no explanation under Section 4.0, General Proposal Requirements.
	Answer:	We apologize – that reference is an error on our part and does not apply here. Disregard the wording 'Mandatory Requirements' from the list.
24	Question:	Does the County have an anticipated timeframe of completion?
	Answer:	No, the County does not have an anticipated timeframe of completion. In a discussion with a consultant for a similar study in another state, an timeframe of six months was given -- this may or may not be reflective of what will be needed here in Dane County.
25	Question:	Is it fair to assume that item 5.7 Potential business structure analysis (p14) should not include a legal assessment of the various business structures (we don't need a business attorney on our

		project team), but rather would address the pro's and con's of each business type as it relates to financing and operations from a technical level?
	Answer:	Yes, this is a fair assessment.
26	Question:	What information, if any, does the County have related to the farms, which is not included in the referenced reports that would be pertinent to this study?
	Answer:	This questions is very broad and it thus difficult to answer. The County has both an Livestock Agent in the UW Extension Office and experienced staff within its Land and Water Conservation Office that can provide information on specific issues. For example, if information were sought on the type of bedding used or the status of nutrient management plans, this would be available from County staff.
27	Question:	Will the contract be set up as a fixed fee or time and materials (not to exceed without prior authorization)?
	Answer:	It will be set up as time and materials, not to exceed without prior authorization.
28	Question:	I noticed that biomass resources will be considered "available" for the feasibility study. What about yard waste and urban tree waste? As you know we need to look at a variety of bi-products after digestion. The wood waste might be needed for composting. The grass and even leaf waste might be very helpful to the digestion process and the quantity of biogas that could be produced.
	Answer:	The proposer is welcome to look at other substrates. It should be recognized that the state has banned yard materials from landfills for over 10 years and that there are existing systems to handle these materials.
29	Question:	I guess that you are discouraging the utilization of food processing waste in the feasibility study because there is not much available in Dane County. In Minnesota and in Iowa, we have facilities that open and gather food processing materials for 100-400 miles away. Would you reconsider for certain specific wastes? What about source separated organics from Madison? As you know Toronto, San Francisco, parts of Seattle, Hutchinson, Minnesota; Wayzata, Minnesota and other communities have these programs in place. Could this be included? Even lunch room school waste might be possible as an organic waste from the community. Would including any of these wastes in the feasibility study be considered acceptable?
	Answer:	The proposer is welcome to look at other substrates. We will

		provide information on the materials from food processing facilities in the County; for other materials, the responsibility for gathering information will be the responsibility of the vendor.
30	Question:	What is the size of the Lake Mendota watershed?
	Answer:	It covers approximately 200 square miles within Dane County and includes most or all of 5 townships, approximately half of 3 townships (two of which are mostly urban) and small parts of two townships. It can be viewed at <a href="http://www.danewaters.com/resource/WatershedMap.aspx">http://www.danewaters.com/resource/WatershedMap.aspx</a> and includes both the Yahara River and Lake Mendota watershed and the Six Mile and Pheasant Branch Creeks watershed.
31	Question:	RFP Section 4.2, B states: "Describe the availability of assigned personnel to provide service in an efficient and timely manner with respect to the scale and peripheral hardware as well as software support services." We assume the last half of this sentence is from a previous RFP and does not apply to this RFP. Please clarify.
	Answer:	You are correct. This reference should be disregarded.
32	Question:	Section 6.2 - Format for Submitting Cost Proposals and Attachment E: The cost summary sheet included in the RFP Attachment E is not very prescriptive. Does the County have a preference for Lump Sum, Time and Expense, or other payment types for this project? How much detail is required for the cost proposal?
	Answer:	It will be set up as time and materials, not to exceed without prior authorization. The cost proposal should indicate staff that would be involved, their time for specific activities and their rate of charges, along with descriptions and costs of materials any other expenses, such as travel.
33	Question:	Section 7.1 - Payments states: "Payment may be made to the Contractor any time after the product has been accepted by the County, but not sooner than thirty (30) days after completion." Given that the project will require several months, this payment term doesn't appear to apply to this RFP. Please clarify.
	Answer:	Please see questions and answers #2 and #15. We will provide in-progress payments and this schedule and milestones will be decided during negotiation.
34	Question:	Attachment C states "...If vendor is proposing any arrangement involving a third party, the named references should also be involved in a similar arrangement." Does the reference to "third party" in this statement include subconsultants? If so, please clarify what information you are requesting.

	Answer:	The arrangement between the subcontractors and the vendor should be described, including any past working relationships and the work that will be done by the subcontractors. The references need only be supplied for the main contractor.
35	Question:	If we team with a University, are they required to be listed as a vendor with the County? Are they required to have the minimum prescribed insurance?
	Answer:	Subcontractors will not need to be registered as a vendor with the County. They will need to have the prescribed insurance.

A vendor conference was held on November 7, 2006, with 35 people present, including three County staff. The following is a listing of questions raised at the vendor conference and the answers to those questions.

1	Questions	Will subcontractors need to register with the County?
	Answer:	No, subcontractors will not need to register with the County.
2	Question:	Will subcontractors be required to carry \$1 million in insurance?
	Answer:	Yes, they will be required to carry this insurance.
3	Question:	Can the feasibility study include pilot or demonstration projects?
	Answer:	No, the study is not to include any physical construction; only a study of the feasibility of alternatives.
4	Question:	When will contacts be made for oral interview? How much time will be available for proposers to prepare?
	Answer:	We expect that we will finish our review of the proposals in the week of November 27, 2006 and will be calling the proposers that week or the next for interviews in early December.
5	Question:	Does the County require partnerships with minority or women-owned businesses?
	Answer:	The County encourages these partnerships, but does not require them, nor assign extra points in the review process for such partnerships.
6	Question:	Will any of the feasibility work be done outside the Upper Lake Mendota Watershed?
	Answer:	The feasibility study is to focus on this area, although proposers can suggest activities outside this area. In addition, the costs of

		transporting manure to a facility from distances of 10 and 20 miles extends beyond the Lake Mendota Watershed.
7	Question:	Can the feasibility study include agreements with local wastewater treatment plants to handle manure?
	Answer:	Yes, we encourage looking at a broad range of alternatives.
8	Question:	Will regular (such as monthly) presentations to the advisory committee be required of the vendor?
	Answer:	No. We would expect perhaps only a final presentation to be made to the advisory committee. However, monthly letter reports and a mid-project report to the County would be expected.
9	Question:	What format and what quantity of final report will be required? Will an electronic version be required.
	Answer:	The County has not yet determined the answer to this issue, and it will be addressed during contract negotiation. We would like to be able to share the results of the study with as large an audience as possible, so an electronic version would be very useful.
10	Question:	What level of information do you want proposers to provide for technologies beyond the four listed?
	Answer:	If a proposers plans to explore a system that goes beyond the four required in section 5.3, sufficient information should be provided so that reviewers of the proposals can make a reasonable decision whether or not the proposed approach provides a significant probability of being a useful item to analyze, without the reviewers needing to do any outside research.

The following individuals were present at the vendor conference:

Name	Affiliation	Phone
Richard Brye		(608)831-5878
Dennis Totzke	Applied Technologies, Inc.	(262)784-7690
Cory Wendt	BEST Energies	(608)827-2940
Michael Zander	Biogas Direct LLC	(608)644-1112
Gia Maestri	Biogas Direct LLC	(608)644-1112
Jen Keuning	Conestoga-Rovers & Assoc.	(920)362-1560
Kevin Connors	Dane County LWRD	(608)224-3731
Francisco Silva	Dane County Purchasing	(608)267-3523
John Reindl	Dane County PW	(608)267-8815
Joe Kramer	Energy Ctr. of WI	(608)238-8276 x119
Douglas B. Johnson	Environmental Intelligence	(612)387-3430
Clay Hardenburger	FABCO Powers Systems	(920)533-3483

Rich Hasselman	GDS Associates	(608)273-0182 x11
Steve Dvorak	GHD, Inc.	(920)849-9797
Jon Going	Inland / GE Jenbacher	(262)825-5562
Brian Hinrichs	Liesch Env. Serv.	(608)223-1532
Josh Davenport	Liesch Env. Serv.	(608)223-1532
Pete Pittner	Miller Engineers & Scientists	(920)458-6164
Steve Dominick	NOVI / WES	(630-377-0662
Jeff Reinkemeyer	RMT	(608)231-4444
Mark Torresani	RMT	(608)831-4444
Jennifer Moehlmann	Sebesta Blomberg	(515)279-4990
Doug Bach	SEH, Inc.	(608)270-5386
Mitchell Klasky	SJH & Company	(617)239-1120
Randy Wirtz	Strand Assoc.	(608)251-4843
Sharon Myers	Symbiont	(414)291-8840
Michael J. Tiry	Tiry Engineering, Inc.	(715)723-6777
Leah Tiry	Tiry Engineering, Inc.	(715)723-6777
Dan Brady	TN&A	(414)607-6722
Tom Breunig	TTG Consulting	(608)235-5056
Michael Tierney	URS Corporation	(608)354-5337
Tim Zauche	UW – Platteville	(608)342-1678
Dana Jensen	Vandewalle & Associates	(608)255-3988
Kurt Muchow	Vierbicher Associates	(608)524-6468
Eric Kostecki	Wisconsin Public Power	(608)834-4500

If you have any questions regarding this addendum, please contact me at 608/267-3523.

Francisco Silva, CPPB  
Purchasing Agent