

# **TORONTO** STAFF REPORT

---

April 27, 2004

To: Works Committee

From: Commissioner, Works and Emergency Services  
Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer

Subject: Development and Operation of a Small-Scale Research Facility for Processing Residual Municipal Solid Waste  
Request for Qualifications No. 9155-04-7021  
(All Wards)

Purpose:

To report on the results of the Request for Qualifications (the "RFQL") No. 9155-04-7021 for the development and operation of a small-scale research facility (the "SSRF") for processing residual municipal solid waste and to recommend future actions in the development and release of a Request for Proposals (the "RFP") for the development and operation of an SSRF for residual municipal solid waste processing.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

There are no direct financial implications resulting from this report. Subsequent reports will identify the costs associated with the development and operation of an SSRF.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) the Respondents identified in this report having satisfied all of the requirements of Request for Qualifications No. 9155-04-7021, be designated "Qualified Respondents" and thereby be eligible to respond to a future Request for Proposal for the development and operation of a small-scale research facility for processing residual municipal solid waste; and
- (2) subject to adoption of Recommendation No. 1, it is further recommended that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be authorized to develop a Request for Proposal for the development and operation of a small-scale research facility for residual

municipal solid waste processing, including identification of a suitable City owned site, or sites, and to forward the key terms of reference of the Request for Proposal to Works Committee and Council prior to release.

Background:

In order to reach the objective of 100 percent diversion by 2010, City Council's Task Force 2010 (June 2001) identified the need to consider new and emerging technologies to manage residual municipal solid waste remaining after utilization of curbside recycling and organic materials diversion programs. Subsequently, the New and Emerging Technologies, Policies and Practices Citizen and Expert Advisory Group (the "Advisory Group") was formed. One of the objectives of the Advisory Group is to assist the City to plan its residual municipal solid waste management system.

In early 2003, a planning initiative was developed at a GTA-wide level with the participation of the Ministry of the Environment (the "MOE") to explore the potential application of New and Emerging Technologies (the "NET") for residual municipal solid waste management. In turn, the concept of research facilities was further developed to facilitate the evaluation of the performance of NETs under Ontario's specific regulatory requirements utilizing our unique residual municipal solid waste stream as the process feedstock. Following this development a formal procurement process was initiated.

On April 14, 15 and 16, 2003, City Council had before it Clause No. 2 of Report No. 3 of the Works Committee and upon amending and adopting the report directed the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services to:

- 1) issue in May 2003 a 'Request for Expressions of Interest' to the marketplace for new and emerging solid waste management technologies;
- 2) issue a subsequent Request for Qualifications to new and emerging solid waste management technology proponents in 2003;
- 3) submit a report to the Works Committee no later than January 2004 on the outcome of the Request for Qualifications cited above in Recommendation No. 2), and submit at that time recommendations for the potential issuance of a Request for Proposals for new and emerging technology proposals; and,
- 4) to submit a report to the Works Committee by September 30, 2003, on the results of the Request for Expressions of Interest, the proposed content and requirements of the Request for Qualifications, and the workplan and timeframe for the environmental assessment process.

At its meeting of September 22, 23, 24 and 25 2003, Council had before it Clause No. 41 embodied in Report No. 9 of the Policy and Finance Committee which recommended adoption of the August 15, 2003, report from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services that provided the results of Request for Expressions of Interest No. 9155-03-7283. In addition, Council adopted a supplementary report from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services dated September 15, 2003, entitled "Evaluation Criteria and Language for Request for Qualifications for a Small-Scale Research Facility Employing New and Emerging Technologies for Managing Toronto's Residual Solid Waste."

This supplemental report provided the preliminary terms of reference for the RFQL as presented to the Advisory Group at their meeting of September 11, 2003. The presentation addressed the scope, scale and duration of the SSRF project and proposed criteria to be used to assess responses to the RFQL.

City Council adopted the following amended recommendations of Policy and Finance Committee. It was recommended that:

- 1) the proposed issuance of a Request for Qualifications for new and emerging solid waste management technologies be issued under the City of Toronto's Lobbying Disclosure Policy;
- 2) the City Clerk be requested to submit directly to Works Committee quarterly reports containing a summary of the lobbying disclosures submitted by potential vendors following the issuance of the Request for Qualifications cited in Recommendation No. (1) and post those reports on the City of Toronto Web site; and,
- 3) upon completion of the Request for Qualifications, the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to submit to the Works Committee a series of steps to manage the lobbying protocol at the Request for Proposals stage for the small scale research facilities that are presented.

Therefore, this report is intended to report on the outcome of the RFQL process for the SSRF project and to submit procedures to manage the lobbying protocol at the RFP stage, as directed by Council.

#### GTA Collaboration

At its meeting of September 4, 2003, Works Committee received for information a report dated August 20, 2003, from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services entitled "Co-ordination of Waste Diversion and Disposal Initiatives in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA)."

This report provided information on the status of co-operative efforts that are underway between the City of Toronto, the Regional Municipalities of York, Peel and Durham, and the MOE to coordinate waste diversion and disposal initiatives in the GTA and advised that staff were proceeding to participate in the retention of consultants to analyze the recently received responses to the Request for Expressions for Interest for New and Emerging Technologies.

In October 2003, consultants working on behalf of the cooperating GTA municipalities submitted a report entitled, "Summary of Individual Responses to Toronto's REOI on New and Emerging Waste Management Technologies". That report was distributed to the Advisory Group and was posted on the City's New and Emerging Technologies web page ([www.toronto.ca/net](http://www.toronto.ca/net)).

#### Environmental Assessment Planning

A separate report from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, that addresses the development of Environmental Assessment (EA) planning for the residual municipal solid waste management system, is scheduled to be on the May 3, 2004, Works Committee agenda.

Comments:

Request for Qualifications Process and Outcome

The purpose of the RFQL was to identify Qualified Respondents, either individual companies, or multiple companies responding as a consortium or joint venture partnership, with the technological, financial, project development and operational capability to develop and operate a SSRF.

Two hundred and fifty-three (253) firms comprised of forty-three (43) firms from the City's bidders list and two hundred and ten (210) firms from the New and Emerging Technologies database were notified and invited to submit qualifications documents for the development and operation of a small-scale research facility for processing residual municipal solid waste. The Request for Qualifications document was also advertised on the City's internet website. This resulted in a total of thirteen (13) submissions being received and opened on March 11, 2004 from the following firms (individual firms and multiple firms responding as consortia or joint venture partnerships):

Respondent	Primary Conversion Technology Type
1. Cinergex Solutions Ltd. / Accelon Energy Systems Inc.	Thermal – gasification
2. Conporec Inc. and Roche Ltee (Joint Venture)	Biological – aerobic composting
3. Enwave District Energy Limited (Consortium of MCW Consultants Ltd., Enerkem Technologies, and the State Group Industrial Ltd.)	Thermal – fluidized bed gasification
4. GeneSyst International Inc.	Biological - fermentation
5. Global Warming Prevention Technologies Inc. (Consortium of SK Precision Hydraulics, Siemens Canada Ltd., Thermogenics Inc., SENES Consultants Ltd., Colt Engineering Corporation, Gardiner Roberts)	Thermal – pyrolysis
6. Greey CTS Inc.	Thermal – fixed bed gasification
7. Heinz Werner Feld – (Consortium of Feld Maschinen und Industriebau GmbH, Ignitec Ingenieurburo fur Gieszereitechnik GmbH and MaSeR LLC)	Thermal – gasification
8. National Waste Services Inc. / Gem Canada Waste to Energy Inc.	Thermal - pyrolysis
9. Pearl Earth Sciences Corp / Startech Environmental Corp. and Hatch Ltd.	Biological – aerobic composting; Thermal - gasification (proposed as separate options)
10. Sanderson Watts Associates Ltd. (Consortium of Thermsave Engineering (UK) Ltd. and SembCorp Industries)	Thermal – steam treatment
11. Solena Group Inc. (Consortium of Ontario Power Generation of Toronto, DTE Energy Services, and Europlasma S.A.)	Thermal – plasma gasification
12. Super Blue Box Recycling Corp.	Biological – anaerobic digestion
13. Trillium Recycling and Energy Management Corporation (Consortium of Ebara Corporation and Environmental Engineering Corporation)	Thermal – fluidized bed gasification

The Qualifications documents were screened by staff from the Solid Waste Management Services Division. The following Respondents submitted Qualifications Documents that were found to have satisfied all mandatory information requirements and screening criteria:

1. Conporec Inc. and Roche Ltee (joint venture),
2. Enwave District Energy Limited (consortium of MCW Consultants Ltd., Enerkem Technologies, and the State Group Industrial Ltd.),
3. Solena Group Inc. (consortium of Ontario Power Generation of Toronto, DTE Energy Services, and Europlasma S.A.), and
4. Trillium Recycling and Energy Management Corporation (consortium of Ebara Corporation and Environmental Engineering Corporation).

Therefore, this report recommends that these Respondents be designated as Qualified Respondents and eligible to respond to the forthcoming RFP.

The key terms of the SSRF project described in the RFQL document were consistent with those contained in a supplementary report from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services dated September 15 2003, which Council had before it at its meeting of September 22, 23, 24 and 25, 2003.

The RFQL defined the scope, scale and duration of the SSRF project and the anticipated general roles and responsibilities of the City and the Contractor. The RFQL stated that the SSRF must be a complete system capable of receiving and processing residual municipal solid waste as collected and of treating and managing all products and all emissions, including atmospheric emissions, solid processing residues and liquid effluent.

After consultation with the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch of the MOE, the scale of the SSRF was set at between 5,000 and 20,000 tonnes of residual municipal solid waste annually. The MOE recommended reducing the scale of the SSRF from the originally proposed maximum of 40,000 tonnes per year to a maximum of 20,000 tonnes per year as, in the opinion of the MOE, the reduced scale would be more consistent with a research project. The duration of the operating period of the SSRF was limited to a maximum of 5 years also to be consistent with a research project.

The RFQL stated that the NETs considered for the SSRF project must be one, or a combination of, the following generic process types:

- i. physical processes such as sorting, separation, size reduction or densification;
- ii. biological processes, such as aerobic composting or anaerobic digestion;
- iii. chemical processes; or,
- iv. advanced thermal processes limited to pyrolysis, fixed-bed gasification, fluidized bed gasification, high temperature gasification and plasma gasification where;
  - a) a synthesis gas is produced; and,
  - b) the synthesis gas is treated prior to thermal oxidation.

The RFQL described two development options: (i) a City owned facility on a City owned site; and, (ii) a contractor owned facility on a contractor owned site. The RFQL did not identify potential sites within or outside of the City for the location of the SSRF and Respondents were directed not to include information on any specific site in their submissions.

The RFQL provided information on the composition and physical and chemical characteristics of residual municipal solid waste based samples of the material collected during a waste audit project conducted in Etobicoke during April – May 2003.

The RFQL defined mandatory information requirements and screening criteria to be used to identify Qualified Respondents with the technological, financial, project development and operational capability to develop and operate an SSRF. A Qualified Respondent, as defined in the RFQL, is a Respondent whose Qualifications Document satisfies all of the mandatory information requirements and screening criteria, as determined by City staff through the screening process described in the document. Only Qualified Respondents are eligible to respond to a forthcoming RFP for the development and operation of an SSRF.

#### RFQL Lobbying Disclosure

In accordance with Council's directions on lobbying disclosure for the RFQL (Council meeting of September 22, 23, 24 and 25 2003, Clause No. 41 of Report No. 9 of the Policy and Finance Committee) Respondents were required to report lobbying activities to the City Clerk on an ongoing basis from the issuance date of the RFQL until its completion, i.e. until written notification of the outcome of the screening of Qualifications Documents is issued to all Respondents. The RFQL document included a form to be used by Respondents to report lobbying activities and directions for submitting the report to the City Clerk.

In a separate report dated April 7, 2004, to the Works Committee entitled, "Summary of Lobbying Disclosure on Request for Qualifications No. 9155-04-7021 for the Development and Operation of a Small-Scale Research Facility for Processing Residual Municipal Solid Waste – First Quarter 2004", the City Clerk reports that, as of the date of the report, the Clerk's Office has not received any lobbying disclosure forms on the RFQL.

#### Request for Proposals for the Development and Operation of an SSRF

Following the completion of the RFQL process, the next stage in the SSRF project is to issue a RFP for the development and operation of an SSRF. This section of the report describes the proposed procedural requirements of the RFP process, including requirements to manage the lobbying process, and key terms of reference for the SSRF project to be expressed in the RFP document.

#### Proposed RFP Procedural Requirements

- i. Participation Limited to Qualified Respondents: only Qualified Respondents identified through the RFQL process would be invited to respond;
- ii. Ban on Lobbying: lobbying would be banned and the only permitted contact with the City would be through a designated City staff contact;

- iii. Proponent Presentations to Works Committee: after the closing date of the RFP, those Qualified Respondents that submitted a proposal would be invited to make a presentation to Works Committee;
- iv. Proponent Information Packages: in addition to the proposal document, Qualified Respondents would be required to provide a package of information on their technology, the purpose of which would be to inform Councillors, staff and the interested public of the nature of their NET and its potential application for processing residual municipal solid waste; and,
- v. Separate Technical Proposals and Price Proposals: Proponents would be required to submit separate technical and sealed price proposals (ie. a “two-envelope system”).

Proposed Key RFP Terms of Reference.

The key terms of reference will be consistent with those stated in the RFQL document.

i. Scope, Scale and Duration:

- a) the SSRF would receive 5,000 to 20,000 tonnes per year of residual municipal solid waste and would operate for a duration of 2 to 5 years (the period of operations would commence upon completion of the design and construction phases);
- b) the SSRF would be a complete system capable of:
  - receiving residual municipal solid waste as collected;
  - separating recoverable or contaminant materials;
  - preparing a suitable feedstock for the NET process through physical operations (eg. sorting, size reduction, densification etc) or other means;
  - processing the prepared feedstock;
  - on-site management of all products from residual municipal solid waste processing;
  - controlling and treating all emissions including gaseous emissions, solid processing residues and liquid effluent; and,
- c) the City may specify the requirement for additional processing capabilities beyond those required by the Contractor to operate the NET, such as the capability to perform additional sorting or separation operations.

ii. Development Options:

The RFP would provide two development options and would allow Proponents to respond to either or both, as follows:

- a) Option 1: Contractor Designs, Builds and Operates a City Owned SSRF on a City Owned Site; and,
- b) Option 2: Contractor Designs, Builds and Operates a Contractor Owned Facility on a Contractor Owned Site

Additional description of each development option, including the requirements of the City and the Contractor for each option, are presented in Attachment No. 1 to this report.

### iii. Facility Siting

For Development Option 1, described above, the City would be required to identify a suitable City owned site, or sites, in the RFP document. Suitable City owned sites will be identified through a constraint mapping exercise undertaken in cooperation with the City's Planning Department. All City owned properties will be assessed; however, specific consideration will be given to utilizing existing solid waste management sites.

### Proposed RFP Evaluation Criteria

Technical proposals and sealed price proposals will be submitted and considered separately. Proposals would be selected on the basis of the greatest value to the City's long-term residual municipal solid management system planning process at an acceptable cost.

Technical proposals would be evaluated using the criteria presented in Attachment No. 2 to this report.

### Comments: Request for Qualifications Summary of Advisory Group Resolutions

The SSRF project has been discussed by the Advisory Group at a number of its meetings spanning the period from August 2003, to April 2004. Opinion in support of, and in opposition to, undertaking the SSRF project at this time have been expressed by Advisory Group members. The most recent resolution, adopted by the Advisory Group on April 7, 2004, states:

“THAT: In September, City Council instructed staff to proceed with an RFQL for establishing a research facility or facilities for new and emerging technologies for the diversion of solid wastes from landfilling. While the Advisory Group fully appreciates the value of research, as well as development and demonstration of new and emerging technologies, it recommended at that time that it was premature to make a decision about such facilities. After further consideration and working with staff on the development of the RFQL, the Advisory Group strongly recommends that the City Council delay the decision on issuing an RFP for such a research facility until the following are completed:

1. There has been a full evaluation of waste processing technologies and the implications for the need for research on any of these technologies for processing Toronto's solid residuals;

2. Alternative means of obtaining the needed research data have been fully considered - options such as testing representative feed samples at existing facilities located elsewhere could require much less time and cost;
3. The timeline for implementing a research facility and carrying out the research has been fully considered in relation to the timeline for the planned environmental assessment process; and
4. There has been a written legal opinion (with respect to Provincial statutes and City by-laws) on the building of such a research facility and what types of facilities might be allowed.”

#### Staff Response to the Advisory Group Resolutions

In response to the above-cited resolutions from the Advisory Group, project staff have prepared the following responses:

1. Project staff appreciate the important role for research in the evaluation of NETs and believe that, in addition to other research activities, it is important to actively research the performance of NETs utilizing Toronto’s unique residual municipal solid waste as process feedstock and to operate under Ontario’s regulatory requirements.
2. Project staff support exploring a variety of alternative research methods and, if opportunities exist, may recommend shipping waste to facilities in other jurisdictions for processing by a NET. However, project staff believe that there is no acceptable alternative to the new information that could be derived from the operation of an SSRF.
3. The new information derived from the SSRF would be made available to the EA process along with information gained from other research activities. A separate report dated from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, that addresses the hiring of an EA consulting firm development of EA planning for the residual municipal solid waste management system, is scheduled to be on the May 3, 2003, Works Committee agenda. The EA consulting firm will be involved in ensuring that process requirements are satisfied.
4. Project staff are consulting with the MOE on the SSRF project. The MOE will confirm the approval requirements for the SSRF once a detailed proposal can be submitted for their review. Prior to construction of any new and emerging facility, a Certificate of Approval must be issued by the Ministry of the Environment. Inherent in the Ministry’s consideration of an SSRF facility application, and subsequent monitoring during operations, are the application of regulatory requirements that are based on protection of human health and environmental sustainability. Similarly, once a detailed SSRF proposal has been developed, it will be subject to a legal review including screening through applicable City by-laws.

Legal Services has been consulted in the preparation of this report.

Conclusions:

The Respondents Comporec Inc. and Roche Ltee (joint venture), Enwave District Energy Limited (consortium of MCW Consultants Ltd., Enerkem Technologies, and the State Group Industrial Ltd.), Solena Group Inc. (consortium of Ontario Power Generation of Toronto, DTE Energy Services, and Europlasma S.A.) and Trillium Recycling and Energy Management Corporation (consortium of Ebara Corporation and Environmental Engineering Corporation) were found to satisfy all mandatory information requirements and screening criteria and are recommended for designation as “Qualified Respondents”.

An SSRF would provide new and valuable information on the performance of a New and Emerging Technology operating under real world conditions specific to Toronto. This information is not available through other means and would therefore complement other information collected for the City’s environmental assessment process for the residual municipal solid waste management system. It is therefore recommended that project staff develop a Request for Proposal for the development and operation of a small-scale research facility for residual municipal solid waste processing.

Contact:

Brian Van Opstal, M.Eng., P.Eng.  
Senior Engineer  
Solid Waste Management Services  
Phone: (416) 397-0143  
Fax: (416) 392-4754

Lou Pagano, P.Eng.  
Director  
Purchasing and Materials Management  
Phone: (416) 392-7312  
Fax: (416) 392-1052

---

Angelos Bacopoulos  
General Manager, Solid Waste Management Services

---

Barry H. Gutteridge  
Commissioner, Works and Emergency Services

---

Joseph P. Pennachetti  
Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer

List of Attachments:

Attachment No. 1 Proposed SSRF Development Options  
Attachment No. 2 Proposed RFP Evaluation Criteria

(p:/2004/wes/swm/apr/028WC.doc)

## **Attachment No. 1: Proposed SSRF Development Options**

The RFP would provide two development options and would allow Proponents to respond to either or both. The development options and the requirements of the City and the Contractor in each case are as follows:

### **i. Option 1: Contractor Designs, Builds and Operates a City Owned SSRF on a City Owned Site**

#### City Responsibilities:

- a) provide a suitable City owned site;
- b) apply for environmental approvals (contractor to provide supporting documents) ;
- c) provide a guaranteed supply of residual municipal solid waste; and,
- d) provide payment for the design and construction and operating phases of the project.

A note on item b) above; the provincial Environmental Assessment Act enables research projects to be exempt from the requirement to undertake an individual environmental assessment. Project staff have consulted with the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch of the MOE and have defined the scope, scale and duration of the SSRF with the intention of qualifying as a research project and being thereby exempt from the requirement to undertake an individual environmental assessment. However, review of the project specifics will be required by the MOE. Should the MOE determine that an individual EA is required, project staff would not recommend proceeding with the SSRF project.

Approval of the SSRF under the provincial Environmental Protection Act would still be required.

#### Contractors Responsibilities:

- a) design and construction of the SSRF;
- b) obtaining all required approvals (other than the environmental approvals obtained by the City);
- c) operation of the SSRF including treatment and management of all emissions including atmospheric emissions, solid processing residues and liquid effluent (other than those managed by the City as described above) and products;
- d) compliance with the requirements of the contract and environmental approvals;
- e) providing access to the SSRF and all operating and processing records; and,
- f) decommissioning the facility at the end of the contract.

### **ii. Option 2: Contractor Designs, Builds and Operates a Contractor Owned Facility on a Contractor Owned Site**

#### City's Responsibilities

- a) provide a guaranteed supply of residual municipal solid waste; and,
- b) provide payment for the operating phase of the project.

#### Contractors Responsibilities:

- a) provide a suitable Contractor owned site;
- b) obtaining all required approvals including environmental approvals;
- c) design, construction and operation of the SSRF including treatment and management of all emissions (including atmospheric emissions, solid processing residues and liquid effluent) and products;
- d) compliance with the requirements of the contract and environmental approvals; and,
- e) providing access to the SSRF and all operating and processing records.

## **Attachment No. 2: Proposed RFP Evaluation Criteria**

The proposed criteria to be used to evaluate proposals submitted in response to the Request for Proposal for the development and operation of a small-scale research facility are presented below.

### **1.0 Criteria to Evaluate the Proponent's Capabilities**

- 1-1 Financial Capabilities
- 1-2 Operational Capabilities
- 1-3 Design and Construction Capabilities

### **2.0 Criteria to Evaluate the Capabilities of the Proposed New and Emerging Technology (based on information provided for Reference Facilities)**

- 2-1 Stage of Development
- 2-2 Diversion From Landfill
- 2-3 Quantity and Quality of Products Recovered or Derived
- 2-4 Quantity and Composition of Emissions
  - 2-3-1 Atmospheric Emissions
  - 2-3-2 Solid Process Residues
  - 2-3-3 Liquid Effluent
- 2-5 References

### **3-0 Criteria to Evaluate the Design of the Proposed SSRF**

- 3-1 Processing Capacity (tonnes per year)
- 3-2 Overall Soundness of Design
- 3-3 Quality of the Design of Specified Additional Processing Capabilities
- 3-4 Quality and Reliability of Key Processing Equipment and Systems
- 3-5 Quality and Reliability of Emissions Control and Treatment Systems
  - 3-5-1 Atmospheric Emissions
  - 3-5-2 Solid Process Residues
  - 3-5-3 Liquid Effluent
- 3-6 Quality and Reliability of Process Monitoring and Control Systems
- 3-7 Quality of Design Considerations for Occupational Safety and Hygiene

### **4-0 Criteria to Evaluate the Development of the Proposed SSRF**

- 4-1 Processing Capacity Availability Date
- 4-2 Completeness and Complexity of the Development Schedule
- 4-3 Likelihood of Meeting the Processing Capacity Availability Date

### **5-0 Criteria to Evaluate the Performance of the Proposed SSRF**

- 5-1 Overall Diversion Rate
- 5-2 Quantity and Composition of Products and Marketability in Ontario
- 5-3 Quantity and Composition of Emissions
  - 5-3-1 Atmospheric Emissions
  - 5-3-2 Solid Process Residues
  - 5-3-3 Liquid Effluent
- 5-4 Overall Energy Consumption or Production

### **6-0 Criteria to Evaluate the Operation of the Proposed SSRF**

- 6-1 Completeness and Quality of Operating Plans (staff and other resources)
- 6-2 Completeness and Quality of Maintenance Program
- 6-3 Operational Availability (ie. scheduled and unscheduled downtime)
- 6-4 Utility Consumption (ie. electricity, gas, water etc.)
- 6-5 Consumption of Other Products or Services (eg. process chemicals)
- 6-6 Completeness and Quality of Contingency Plans (eg. fire, power failure, spills etc.)
- 6-7 Operational Flexibility

### **7-0 Overall Quality of the Proposal**

- 7-1 Compliance With the Requirements of the Work (ie. number and significance of exceptions to the requirements of the work as specified in the RFP)
- 7-2 Overall Quantity and Quality of New Information (eg. quality of operating records, processing records or other investigations as required)