



**Investment  
Agriculture  
Foundation**  
*of British Columbia*

## **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**Title:**

**Feasibility Study for Gasification of Poultry Litter and  
Animal Carcass Tissue**

**Closing Date and Time:**

Proposals must be received by  
**Noon, January 29<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

**Closing Location:**

Investment Agriculture Foundation of BC  
Attention: Rick Van Kleeck  
c/o 1767 Angus Campbell Rd.  
Abbotsford, BC V3G 2M3

**Contact:**

Rick Van Kleeck  
Coordinator – Livestock Waste Tissue Initiative  
Phone: 604-556-3145  
Fax: 604-556-3099  
Email: [rvankleeck@iafbc.ca](mailto:rvankleeck@iafbc.ca)

*Funding provided by:*



## Introduction

In broadest terms, the project requires that the economic and operational feasibility of gasification of poultry litter, spent hens and specified risk material (SRM) be investigated. The feasibility study is to be based around a specific example site and a defined volume of feedstock with known characteristics (proximate and ultimate analysis). The main goal of the studied gasification project will be to turn waste management problems into renewable energy production and net environmental benefits. As with all projects of this kind, air emissions will be one of the most important issues to solve. To stand a chance of community acceptance the gasification facility should aim to both replace air emissions from already existing energy production capacity and reduce overall emissions as compared with the current state.

The poultry industry has for a long time been looking for ways to divert poultry litter from sensitive aquifers. The industry is also feeling increased pressure to find alternatives to land application of poultry litter due to the ever intensifying land squeeze in the Lower Mainland. In addition, the poultry industry is looking for a less costly way to dispose of spent hens. For its part, the abattoir industry is facing unprecedented waste disposal costs for SRM as a result of tightening regulations. It has become a business imperative for the abattoir industry to find alternative waste management options at a lower cost.

Investment Agriculture Foundation and the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands are trying to assist the agricultural industry and local governments in preparing for emergencies resulting in mass animal mortalities. In certain situations, combustion would be the only appropriate, safe and legal emergency disposal alternative. No suitable combustion capacity exists within a reasonable transportation range from the lower mainland, which is the geographical area of BC where emergency animal carcass disposal is the most challenging. In order to have emergency combustion capacity available in an instant at the time of need it is required that the facility in question is able to operate continuously based on a solid business model, independent of emergencies, built around available continuous waste streams (such as poultry litter, spent hens and SRM).

With this as a backdrop the poultry and abattoir industries have come together with Investment Agriculture Foundation and the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands as a steering committee to investigate if gasification with the purpose of generating energy may present a feasible solution to their combined issues. To this end, the steering committee wishes to develop a site specific  $\pm 30\%$  economic feasibility assessment for gasification of poultry litter, spent hens and SRM on a continuous basis, with the ability to significantly increase the animal tissue component of the feedstock the event of an emergency. For accessibility and transportation cost reasons as well as adherence to the concept of not exporting waste management issues to other regions it is anticipated that the example site for this feasibility study will be located somewhere in the Lower Mainland.

The consultant selected to carry out this project will be provided with a short list of possible sites, and will be expected to select one for this study.

# Background

## Description of Intended Feedstock

### Continuous Feedstock

Continuous daily feedstock is intended to consist of constant proportions of poultry litter (majority), spent hens (minority) and SRM (minority). All feedstock originating in the lower Fraser Valley of BC (unless otherwise noted). The appropriate proportions are to be set in this study. A brief background on each of the daily feedstock components follows below. For each potential feedstock one set of samples has been collected and tested for proximate analysis, ultimate analysis, mineral analysis, and fusion temperatures of ash. Should more feedstock characterization be needed to meet the accuracy required for this study, please include this work in your proposal.

*Poultry litter:* The type of poultry litter that is applicable to this project is broiler litter and turkey litter. Both fractions consist of feces, wood shavings or saw dust bedding material and some feathers. It is estimated that up to 120 tonnes / day of broiler and turkey litter may be available for gasification (20% of total poultry industry output in the Lower Mainland). The actual interest of supplying litter to a gasification project will depend on the economic upside of such an endeavor. Results for proximate and ultimate analysis of turkey and broiler litter can be found in Appendix A and B. The turkey litter results are seen as representative while the broiler litter results seem to be off on the moisture content. Broiler litter delivered directly from the barn to a gasification plant should have a moisture content of approximately 30%. The other ultimate and proximate parameters for broiler litter should be representative if adjusted to 30% moisture content. Currently, poultry producers are usually paid enough for the litter to cover transportation costs from the poultry farm to the user of the litter.

*Spent hens:* Spent hens are birds that have reached the end of their productive life span as egg layers. In most cases the meat is not salvageable at a reasonable rate of return. Consequently, the bird carcasses become a waste product that is normally rendered for extraction of tallow and production of meat and bone meal. Rendering represents a cost to egg producers of approximately \$110/tonne of spent hens. Depending on the economical upside of an alternative involving gasification as much as 8 tonnes / day of spent hens may be available. Results for proximate and ultimate analysis of spent hens can be found in Appendix C. The results are seen as representative. Since the timing of life cycles of egg laying hens are spread out in the industry there are continuously flocks being replaced. Therefore, spent hens may be considered a continuous feedstock provided that industry coordination can be achieved.

*Specified Risk Material (SRM):* At the beginning of July, 2007, enhanced animal health safeguards came into effect to help eliminate bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE), or mad cow disease, from Canada. To this end, stringent requirements for disposal (destruction or containment) were introduced for certain cattle tissues capable of transmitting BSE. This tissue has been termed specified risk material (SRM). SRM is defined as the skull, brain, trigeminal ganglia (nerves attached to the brain), eyes, tonsils, spinal cord and dorsal root ganglia (nerves attached to the spinal cord) of cattle aged 30 months or older; and the distal ileum (portion of the small intestine) of cattle of all ages. The SRM discussed here is a continuous waste product from the abattoir industry combined with normal continuous production losses from the animal husbandry industries.

Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) who regulates SRM management has put rules in place for the destruction of SRM through “combustion”. Dual chamber incineration at high enough temperatures and with certain demands on temperature monitoring is approved as a safe SRM destruction method under these rules. Gasification, which is the technology that will be investigated in this study, at the same temperatures, while meeting the same temperature monitoring and design criteria would also be acceptable. It is required to fit the operational parameters of the investigated gasification project to the CFIA SRM destruction criteria relevant to gasification. The relevant SRM destruction criteria are (consultant to verify with CFIA):

1. The primary chamber is preheated to a minimum of 850°C prior to the addition of SRM. If the primary chamber is not preheated, any secondary chamber must be heated to a minimum of 850°C and maintained at or above this temperature during the entire incineration cycle, including the period of charging.
2. SRM remains in the primary chamber at a temperature of 850°C or above for the length of time required to reduce all organic material inputs to ash. Alternate parameters in time and temperature may only be used if based on acceptable results of a specific risk assessment conducted or approved by the CFIA.
3. Upon exhausting, all matter volatilized by the primary chamber is further subjected to an additional controlled residency time of at least 2 seconds in secondary chamber at a minimum temperature of 850°C.

Results for proximate and ultimate analysis of SRM can be found in Appendix D. The results are seen as representative. Current disposal pathway represents a cost to abattoirs of \$264/tonne. Depending on the economical upside of an alternative involving gasification as much as 12 tonnes / day of SRM may be available from the Lower Mainland with an additional 3 tonnes /day potentially available from Vancouver Island and Southern Interior combined. It should be noted that Vancouver Island/Southern Interior portions are dependent on significantly higher transportation costs. Also, both the 12 tonnes and 3 tonnes levels assume that a lower SRM disposal cost would result in a 50% increase in deadstock volume being picked up by licensed deadstock pick-up service providers.

### Occasional Emergency Feedstock

It is hoped that the gasification facility studied here also may provide some temporary animal carcass disposal capacity for occasional emergencies. In such an event, the normal daily feedstock use presented above would be disrupted in favor of a significantly increased proportion of animal tissue. The type of animal tissue would vary depending on the type of emergency. For example, the tissue in question would be exclusively poultry in the case of an Avian Influenza emergency, while a flood scenario would generate a mix of tissue with an emphasis on cattle tissue and related SRM. The maximum proportion of animal tissue in the gasification feedstock would be determined by the technical limitations at the plant, such as total energy content and moisture content requirements of the feedstock mix. To prevent odour and the potential of further animal disease spread all emergency animal tissue would come to the gasification plant in a ground, pumpable pulp form in a sealed tanker truck (similar to septic tank trucks) for direct injection into the gasification chamber.

Since emergency carcass tissue may be from a mix of animals it is hard to pinpoint any specific sample types to analyze for proximate and ultimate parameters. We suggest that the

contractor use the proximate and ultimate analysis results from spent hens, which as stated earlier are available in Appendix C, since they represent samples from a whole animal. We also suggest that the contractor consider results for generic slaughter waste (non-SRM portion) also available in Appendix E. The total maximum fuel flow of animal carcass tissue that would be gasified at the plant in the event of an emergency will be determined by the technical plant limitations for a facility that primarily is optimized for the “normal” non-emergency feedstock mix (e.g. optimized for feedstock presented under the “Continuous Feedstock” heading above).

### **Preceding Study**

In 2008, Stantec performed an economic assessment of combustion technologies for specified risk material disposal in British Columbia. The Stantec study is highly relevant as it includes a scenario (scenario 4) which is very close to what needs to be explored in more detail in this feasibility study. The Stantec report can be found in Appendix F. The final operational scale and feedstock amounts and proportions investigated in this study should be determined from the energy needs at the selected example site and availability of continuous feedstock in combination with a realistic estimate of the potential for sale of surplus energy to the grid.

# Terms of Reference and Project Requirements

## Goal:

To develop a site specific feasibility assessment of utilizing gasification technology to generate energy from a feedstock made up of poultry litter and animal carcass tissue. The feasibility assessment is to be accurate within  $\pm 30\%$ .

## Project Tasks:

1. To develop appropriate site selection criteria.
2. To select an example site to base the feasibility study on by applying developed site selection criteria to a collection of sites as suggested by the steering committee (steering committee is aiming to provide contractor with a roster of 3-4 sites, for example greenhouses, other industrial and agricultural heat and power users etc.).
3. To identify energy needs at the selected site and potential for sale of surplus energy to the grid.
4. To determine which energy generation pathway makes the most economic sense for the gasification project at hand, e.g. heat only **or** internal combustion engine driven co-generation of electricity and heat **or** steam turbine driven co-generation of electricity and heat **or** methanation of syn-gas for further upgrading to biomethane with natural gas specification **or** any combination of the above.
5. To determine required operational scale of the gasification project to meet the needs identified in task 3 and 4. The upper limit of operational scale is set by potentially available feedstock volumes as identified in the “background” section of this document.
6. To determine actual required feedstock volumes and the best suited feedstock combination to meet the needs of the operational scale determined in task 5.

## Possible Milestone A: (for tasks 1 – 6) “Project Definition”

7. To develop appropriate technology supplier selection criteria based on the results of tasks 3 to 6 as well as all the information supplied or referred to under the “background” heading of this document, paying particular attention to the combustion requirements for SRM destruction.
8. To create a formal bid specification and obtain quotes from at least three gasification technology suppliers based on information gathered and tentative conclusions drawn under tasks 1 to 7.
9. To obtain at least one quote for energy generation infrastructure unless already included as part of the quote from gasification technology supplier.
10. To obtain at least one quote for emissions cleaning infrastructure unless already included as part of the quote from gasification technology supplier.
11. To obtain at least one quote for materials handling and other balance of plant infrastructure unless already included as part of the quote from gasification technology supplier.

12. To select one gasification supplier, one energy generation equipment supplier, emissions cleaning technology supplier and balance of plant equipment supplier(s) (could potentially all be one and the same) to serve as the example technology for the feasibility study by applying the selection criteria developed under task 7 to the quotes obtained under task 8 to 11.

Possible Milestone B: (for tasks 7 – 12) “Technology Selection”

13. To determine the likely point of utility grid interconnection and interconnection cost.

14. To develop a capital cost estimate for the full plant.

15. To develop a soft cost estimate for required engineering and permitting.

16. To develop a construction cost estimate.

17. To develop an estimate of the cost of operation.

18. To amalgamate the results of task 13 to 17 into a  $\pm 30\%$  total project cost estimate

19. To assume a reasonable financing structure for the total project cost, e.g. the ratio of debt : private capital : grant. (The steering committee will help with this.)

20. To estimate the amount of verifiable carbon offsets that would result from implementing the investigated project (in tonnes CO<sub>2</sub> eqv).

Possible Milestone C: (for tasks 13 – 20) “Cost Estimate”

21. Model economic feasibility of the total project by assuming various values for the following variables:

- Average / tonne transportation cost for SRM
- \$ / tonne tipping fee for SRM (\$75/tonne - \$150/tonne, e.g. \$0.034/lbs - \$0.068/lbs)
- Average / tonne transportation cost for spent hens
- \$ / tonne tipping fee for spent hens (\$50/tonne - \$100/tonne, e.g. \$0.023/lbs - \$0.045/lbs)
- Average / tonne transportation cost for poultry litter (\$10/tonne - \$20/tonne)
- \$ / energy unit for energy supplied to host site
- \$ / energy unit sold to the grid
- \$ / tonne carbon offset (\$10/ tonne CO<sub>2</sub> eqv - \$20 / tonne CO<sub>2</sub> eqv)
- Positive net present value (NPV) with minimum acceptable rate of return (MARR 10% - 25%)

22. To perform a sensitivity analysis to determine impact on the economic feasibility of the optimum scenario selected under task 21 by changes to:

- Error in total project cost estimate (-30% - +30%)
- Interest rates
- Loss of access to one or several feedstock components
- Tightened environmental regulations in the future, in particular where air discharges are concerned

Possible Milestone D: (for tasks 21 – 22) “Feasibility Assessment”

23. To estimate resulting stack air emissions from the project using information from the suppliers of gasification and emissions cleaning equipment as well as literature and theoretical mass and energy balance calculations. The estimated emissions parameters to consider are PM, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, SO<sub>x</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, VOC, CO and CO<sub>2</sub>.
24. To estimate stack air emissions from current energy generation activities at the host site, e.g. the on-site energy generation that would be off-set by the gasification project. The estimated emissions parameters to consider are PM, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, SO<sub>x</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, VOC, CO and CO<sub>2</sub>.
25. To provide a net comparison between stack air emissions generated at the host site in the current situation and what would be emitted from the gasification project. The emissions parameters to compare are PM, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, SO<sub>x</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, VOC, CO and CO<sub>2</sub>.
26. To estimate the avoided air emissions that result from using poultry litter as gasification fuel instead of traditional land application. The emissions parameters to consider under this task are PM, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, NH<sub>4</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O.

Possible Milestone E: (for tasks 23 – 26) “Air Quality Assessment”

27. To investigate the technical maximum proportion of emergency animal tissue in the gasification feedstock while maintaining acceptable gasification performance without altering any vital design features set under task 1 through 21.
28. To suggest a fuel delivery design whereby ground, pumpable animal tissue slurry can be introduced to the gasification chamber in a manner that meet the SRM destruction requirements presented under the “Background” heading. The animal tissue slurry fuel delivery system should be designed to deliver a fuel flow ranging from the every day, continuous flow of SRM and spent hens tissue to the emergency animal tissue flow as determined under task 27.
29. To estimate the discrete cost of adding (engineering, material and installation) a fuel delivery system as described in task 28.

Possible Milestone F: (for tasks 27 – 29) “Emergency Capacity Assessment”

30. A technical description of the envisioned project components reflected in the feasibility study. This description is to be used to communicate scope, capital cost, nature of equipment and the technology employed in the project to stakeholders. The following drawings should be included in the description:
  - Electrical single line diagram
  - Water and water supply options
  - Vendor supplied combustion and air/gas flow sheet
  - Feedstock handling flow sheet
  - Power cycle diagram (if applicable)
  - Cooling system flow sheet (water or air)
  - Ash management system flow sheet
  - Site layout drawing

Possible Milestone G: (for tasks 30) “Project Description”

### **Guiding Principles:**

- The principle of balancing low tipping fees, the need for a net positive environmental impact and a return on investment that will attract investors should be a corner stone in all evaluations related to this feasibility study.
- Due to public sentiment against incineration in the Lower Mainland it will be absolutely necessary to be able to provide solid and highly credible information showing that the project will result in a net improvement of the local environment.
- The site chosen for this project is only to be viewed as a real life example of a reasonable set of site specific conditions. At the same time, the example site should be chosen with such care that it in fact could be a highly appropriate site to build a potential real project. In other words, the site chosen for this project may or may not be the site chosen for a potential real project in the future.
- The owner of the site serving as the example site for this feasibility study should be offered full anonymity, which includes ensuring that the existing operation and the exact location of the site cannot be identified by information provided in the final report.
- It is an important component of this study to assess the opportunity for a facility like the one studied here to provide emergency animal tissue disposal capacity. However, it is not possible to achieve dependable emergency gasification capacity without having an independent business case for continuous daily operation. To have the gasification operating daily in accordance with a solid business plan based on continuously available feedstock is paramount for that facility to be in good repair and ready to go with experienced operators in case of an emergency. That is why the feasibility for the daily operation should be considered a priority when balanced against the capacity for emergency animal tissue disposal.

### **Timelines:**

<b>EVENT</b>	<b>ANTICIPATED DATE</b>
Request for proposal issued	December 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2009
Request for proposal closed	January 29 <sup>th</sup> , 2010
Evaluation of written proposals completed, shortlisted proponents notified	February 12 <sup>th</sup> , 2010
In-person presentation by shortlisted proponents	February 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2010
Successful proponent notified	February 22 <sup>nd</sup> , 2010

Final approval from Investment Agriculture Foundation based on selected proponent, proposed activities and associated confirmed contract cost	March 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2010
Contract finalized	March 30 <sup>th</sup> , 2010
Kick-off meeting with steering committee, contractor receives a roster of potential example sites from steering committee	April 5 <sup>th</sup> , 2010
Contractor picks example site (based on selection criteria developed by contractor)	April 19 <sup>th</sup> , 2010
1 <sup>st</sup> draft report delivered to steering committee	August 16 <sup>th</sup> , 2010
Workshop with steering committee and wider stakeholder group (contractor presents draft results and get feedback)	Week of August 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2010
1 <sup>st</sup> draft report with comments from the steering committee returned to the contractor	August 31 <sup>st</sup> , 2010
2 <sup>nd</sup> draft of the report submitted to steering committee	September 21 <sup>st</sup> , 2010
2 <sup>nd</sup> draft report with comments from the steering committee returned to the contractor	September 30 <sup>th</sup> , 2010
Final report submitted to steering committee	October 14 <sup>th</sup> , 2010

**Deliverables:**

The contract is expected to generate a report that present the results of completing all tasks outlined in this request for proposals.

The above described items are to be compiled in a comprehensive report which should also include a three page executive summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations. Drafts of the full report, including executive summary should be submitted as one electronic copy in word format to the steering committee for comments in accordance with the timelines stipulated above. The timelines presented above apply unless changes explicitly approved by the steering committee have been made.

After required adjustments, the final report is to be submitted to the Livestock Waste Tissue Initiative in word format for final approval and contract closure.

The steering committee is at no time responsible for editing spelling, grammar or formatting in the draft or final report. If, when the second (2<sup>nd</sup>) draft of the report is submitted, it has NOT

been edited to an acceptable language standard, the steering committee will take it upon themselves to have the report professionally edited by a local company and the cost of this editing will be subtracted from the consultant's final payment.

In addition to the report items, the contractor is expected to deliver two half day workshops. The first one is to be a kick-off session where the contractor presents the proposed approach to address the tasks to the steering committee. The second presentation may be to an expanded group of stakeholders, approximately seven weeks before the delivery date for the final report. The second presentation should be based on the content of the first draft report.

The contractor is responsible for arranging bi-weekly conference calls, involving as many as possible of the steering committee, to provide progress reports and to discuss issues related to project management, direction and delivery.

### **Budget**

A total cost of \$200,000 can be used as a benchmark for proposals. However, please be advised that this does not necessarily represent a hard cap, nor a minimum amount.

### **Steering Committee:**

The steering committee for this project consists of representatives from industry, government and funding agencies. The steering committee members are:

- Allan James - BC Agri-Food Sector, Climate Action Initiative
- Dan Kampen and Rick Thiessen - BC Poultry Association
- Garnet Etsell – BC Agriculture Council (BCAC)
- Jim Tessaro & Gustav Rogstrand - BC Ministry of Agriculture & Lands
- Kevin Chipperfield - Sustainable Poultry Farming Group
- Matt Ball - BC Abattoirs Association
- Reg Ens - Agriculture Research and Development Corporation (ArdCorp)
- Rick Van Kleeck – IAF, Livestock Waste Tissue Initiative

This committee will be the primary group evaluating the work of the consultant and will provide input as the project progresses. It is expected that the contractor should set up a kick-off meeting and arrange bi-weekly conference calls, involving as many as possible of the steering committee, to provide progress reports and to discuss issues related to project management, direction and delivery.

In addition to the steering committee, a larger stakeholder group will be informed about the project. The stakeholder group, which will include industry and municipal representatives, will likely be present at the presentation of the draft results towards the end of the project.

# GUIDELINES FOR YOUR PROPOSAL

Responses to this Request for Proposals will be required to outline the process proposed to carry out the work, including milestones and performance measures for each of the tasks.

## **Submission Format**

In order to receive a uniform format of Proposal from all service Proponents, the following guidelines for formatting the Proposal are outlined.

### 1. Letter of Introduction

One page introducing the Proponent and Proponent's submission. This should include a brief history of your company and how long you have been in business. If consultants or firms are combining forces to submit a joint bid, the proposal should clearly identify the lead consultant responsible for successful conduct of the overall study and all involved partners or sub-contractors.

### 2. Proposed Approach

- An outline of the proposed project approach, procedures and timelines in order to meet the tasks of the project and milestones.
- Identification of the project manager and key project support personnel

### 3. Qualifications and References

- Details of the consulting team's experience, knowledge and success in:
  - i. Combustion technologies in general
  - ii. Gasification technologies in particular
  - iii. Economic evaluation of large complex projects
  - iv. Management of large complex projects
  - v. Environmental and social impacts of organic waste management
  - vi. Project management and experience working with government and industry
  - vii. Meeting facilitation and writing of technical reports
  - viii. Conducting effective consultations
- Include a brief resume of the persons providing the services including key subcontractors that you would engage to assist in project completion
- References to be contacted in order to verify your firm's experience and work quality. A minimum of three references are required.

### 4. Costs

- An outline of anticipated time requirements and cost for each milestone and total cost of the proposal.
- An outline of proposed rates including a breakdown by task.
- A fee schedule for any additional work that the Steering Committee may require.

### 5. Appendices

- Any supplemental information you consider to be of value and assistance in evaluating your response.
- Samples of work showing experience in similar projects.

## **Selection Criteria**

Contractor must be well oriented in the technical, legal, environmental and social aspects of gasification of organic waste streams.

Selection will be made by the Steering Committee and will be based on:

- Demonstrated understanding of the scope of the project, including proposed approach;
- Organizational approach to the project and in working with the steering committee;
- Qualifications and experience of the firm and key individuals assigned to the project;
- Demonstrated ability to effectively integrate information with clarity and strategic focus;
- Cost effectiveness and control mechanisms;
- Absence of perceived conflict of interest with your duties to us under the agreement.

## **Submission Instructions and General Information**

This section states the proposal submission procedures that are to be followed and general information regarding the RFP process.

- It is the responsibility of the Proponent to inquire about and clarify any requirement of this RFP that are not understood. Inquiries regarding the RFP should be directed to:  
  
Rick Van Kleeck, Coordinator Livestock Waste Tissue Initiative, Investment Agriculture Foundation of BC [rvankleeck@iafbc.ca](mailto:rvankleeck@iafbc.ca) or 604-556-3145
- All conditions and provisions of this RFP are assumed to be accepted by the Proponent and incorporated by reference in the response, except those conditions and provisions expressly excluded by the Proponent.
- Timelines for the project can be adjusted if the steering committee deems that a change is warranted in the interest of acquiring the best available information to address the tasks of this study.
- On the basis of the information received, the Steering Committee may select the Proponent(s) whose proposal represents the best overall value as solely determined by the Steering Committee, and discuss the terms and conditions which would govern any resulting contract. Best value will include, but is not limited to:
  - i. relevant experience, capability, and qualifications in effectively providing comparable services on other similar projects
  - ii. the respondent's plan to provide the required services and
  - iii. the respondent's financial proposal including payment terms
- The Steering Committee, as a result of this Request for Proposals process, has no obligation to award a contract, is not bound to select the lowest priced proposal, and reserves the right to reject any and all proposals. In no event will the Investment Agriculture Foundation of BC be responsible for costs of proposal preparation or submission. Proposals will not be returned.

- Proponents that wish to be considered must provide ten (10) copies of a written proposal complete with the requested information submitted to the closing location by mail, courier or hand delivery, not later than **Noon, January 29<sup>th</sup>, 2010**. The closing location is:

**Investment Agriculture Foundation of BC**  
**Attention: Rick Van Kleeck**  
**c/o 1767 Angus Campbell Rd.**  
**Abbotsford, BC V3G 2M3**

- Proposals received after the closing time will not be considered.
- Individual presentations by the short listed proponent(s) will be required and these would occur on February 18<sup>th</sup>, 2010 in Abbotsford BC. Each respondent should be prepared to substantiate any areas of the proposal submitted, its own qualifications for the services required, and any other area of interest relative to its proposal.
- All proposals submitted by Proponents will be held in strict confidence. The Steering Committee may reproduce any of the Proponent's Proposal and supporting documents for internal use by the Steering Committee in the selection process or for any other purpose required by law.