



COLORADO
Department of Public
Health & Environment

Bidders Meeting Minutes

Pollution Prevention Advisory Board

Assistance Committee

Wednesday, February 4, 2015

9:00 AM –11:30 AM

CDPHE, Sabin/Cleere Room

Attending: Marjorie Griek, Wolf Kray

Staff: Eric Heyboer, Maria Marquez

Overview

Wolf welcomed everyone on the phone and in the room. He reviewed the meeting's agenda.

Eric explained that the committee consists of thirteen volunteer members representing a cross-section of for-profits, nonprofits, and governments. The committee and staff introduced themselves.

Eric explained that this is the eighth annual grant cycle for the RREO Grant Program. The program was created from the passage of HB 07-1288 and extended through 2026 as a result of SB 13-050. The grant program is funded through the state's Solid Waste User Fee at a rate of \$0.11 per cubic yard of waste that is landfilled.

Wolf described how questions will be answered. The committee will start by reading the questions and answers submitted prior to today's meeting. Questions will then be taken from the audience, starting first with a question in the room followed by a question from someone on the phone. Questions will be taken on an alternating basis until all questions have been answered. Wolf noted that all questions and answers will be posted on the department's website by February 9, 2015 at <https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/cdphe/recycling-grants>.

Wolf stated that applicants may ask additional questions after today's meeting. Questions will be answered through 3:00 PM on February 18, 2015. Questions asked and answered after today's meeting will be posted on the department's website on February 23, 2015.

Eric reviewed the department's invoicing procedures. The grant program functions on a reimbursement-only basis. Applicants must have capital up front to make purchases. Reimbursements can take as long as 30 days to receive. No work done or purchases made prior to the project's official start will be reimbursed. The department requires the use of a standardized invoice template when submitting reimbursement requests. Supporting documentation must be attached to all reimbursement requests. Grantees will receive an email from the department's fiscal officer officially announcing the project start date, which will be July 1, 2015 or later.

The application schedule listed in the Request for Applications document (RFA) was reviewed.

Timeline for the 2015-2016 RREO Grant Program

February 18, 2015, 3:00 PM MST	Deadline to Submit Questions Prior to Application Due Date
March 3, 2015, 3:00 PM MST	Application Due Date
April 15, 2015	Selection Committee Issues Questions Via Email on High Ranking Proposals, If Applicable
April 22, 2015, 3:00 PM MDT	Deadline to Respond to Questions from Selection Committee, If Applicable
May 1 - June 30, 2015	Notice of Grant Awards and Issuance of Contracts and Purchase Orders
July 1, 2015	Earliest Effective Start-Work Date for Awardees
June 30, 2016	Completion of 2015-16 Grant Funded Projects

Links

Eric reminded attendees that resources are available on the department's website.

Final reports from previous grant recipients are posted online at:

<https://www.colorado.gov/cdphe/recycling-grants-and-rebates>

Applicants may also view the grant program's Visioning Project report completed in 2010 at:

https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/sites/default/files/DEHS_RREO_VisionPlanFullReport.pdf

And applicants interested in the Hub-and-Spoke recycling system can learn more at:

<https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/cdphe/hub-and-spoke-recycling-model>

Questions Submitted Prior to Bidders Meeting

Q1: My project will focus on the purchase of a glass crusher to that our recycling program can begin accepting glass. Would this be considered a Tier 1 or Tier 2 project?

A1: This would likely be a Tier 2 project since the focus of the project is on a particular piece of equipment. A Tier 1 project would need to provide evidence of agreements with other communities that would assure recyclables flow from each of the spokes to the hub.

Q2: Will a proposal that requests funds to hire an education and outreach coordinator be reviewed favorably?

A2: This would be eligible as a Tier 3 project; however, all proposals will be considered based on whether the project will be sustained beyond the grant period.

Q3: Regarding used equipment, are there any restrictions or preferences that applicants should be aware of?

A3: No preference is given to proposals that purchase used equipment over new equipment, as each have cost implications. More importantly, applicants must justify why new or used equipment was the best choice given the circumstances.

Q4: The RFA document outlines three distinct tiers. How are these tiers weighted?

A4: The tiers are designed to guide the evaluation committee in assuring that funded projects meet the priorities of the grant program. During the review process, the evaluation committee will meet in-person to review the highest scoring applications and select the winning proposals. Our procedures dictate that Tier 1 projects are given first consideration by the evaluation committee, before Tier 2 and Tier 3 projects are discussed. All top-ranking Tier 1 projects are discussed first to determine what funds remain for high-scoring Tier 2 and Tier 3 projects. This is the extent of how the tiers are weighted. Past experience has shown that not all Tier 1 proposals are automatically funded; 53 percent of funded proposals have been Tier 1, 47 percent of funded proposals have been Tier 2 or Tier 3.

Q5: How many Tier 3 proposals were received in the last grant cycle relative to the total number of proposals received?

A5: Less than 10% of the total proposals received were Tier 3 projects.

Q6: Are nonprofits eligible to apply?

A6: Yes, nonprofits are eligible to apply.

Q7: Can grant funds be used to cover personnel costs?

A7: Tier 2 and Tier 3 projects can request grant funds to cover personnel costs. Tier 1 projects cannot request grant funds to cover personnel costs.

Q8: Since Tier 1 proposals are a top priority for the grant program, how is this measured?

A8: The scoring criteria have been designed to award the maximum points allowed to proposals that include elements of a Hub-and-Spoke network. Even so, this is not a guarantee that all Tier 1 projects will score higher than all lower tiered projects. We have seen Tier 2 projects score higher than Tier 1 projects based on the overall strength of the proposal and how well each of the key evaluation criteria were addressed in the application narrative.

Q9: If a proposal requested grant funds to hire staff to implement the project, is there a requirement that the staff person would need to be retained by the applicant for a certain length of time once the grant cycle ended?

A9: There is no requirement that the staff person be retained by the applicant at the conclusion of the project; however, all proposals are considered based on jobs created and whether the project will be sustained beyond the grant cycle. If the project would end in the event the staff person was terminated, the proposal would be looked on less favorably.

Q10: Are proposals that request funds for anaerobic digestion eligible?

A10: Yes, proposals that implement projects that focus on anaerobic digestion are eligible.

Q11: Will a proposal that develops a Hub-and-Spoke network for organics collection be considered Tier 1?

A11: Yes. The evaluation committee has loosened this requirement for Hub-and-Spoke this year, so Hub-and-Spoke networks may include materials beyond the “traditional” recyclables of paper and containers. This may include organics, construction and demolition waste, electronic waste, etc.

Q12: Can an entity submit more than one grant application in the same grant cycle?

A12: Yes, there is no limit on the number of grant applications an entity can submit in response to this request for applications so long as each application is a truly distinct project.

Q13: Can grant funds be used to establish a pilot program?

A13: The evaluation committee is less inclined to fund pilot projects due to the inherent risk of it being a pilot - the very nature of a pilot is that a successful outcome may or may not be realized. Proposals that can speak to the project’s long-term sustainability and likelihood of success will be looked on most favorably.

Q14: If we have applied for the necessary permits to operate our facility, but the permits are not yet approved, will our proposal be looked on less favorably?

A14: Permits are an important piece to evaluating a proposal’s feasibility of successful implementation, and the evaluation team recognizes that not all permits may be approved by grant application deadline. If the permits are not yet approved, consider how that will affect the project’s implementation timeline. The applicant should explain in the proposal what permits are pending and build their project’s timeline around a reasonable estimate of each permit’s approval date. Also consider what would happen to the project if the permit is not approved in a reasonable amount of time.

Q15: Is it anticipated that Hub-and-Spoke will continue to be the grant program's Tier 1 priority in next year's grant cycle?

A15: Yes

Q16: Are schools eligible to apply?

A16: Yes

Q17: Clarify your expectations for the letters of commitment when compared to letters of support. Should they be addressed to CDPHE or to the organization requesting the grant funds?

A17: To clarify, letters of commitment are somewhat different than letters of support. Letters of support should be addressed to the funding agency. These letters simply show community support for the project, encouraging the funding agency to award a grant to the applicant. Letters of commitment, on the other hand, would be addressed to the applicant of the grant funds. These letters confirm that another entity will play a pivotal role in the implementation of the proposed project. They outline what resources or services this entity will commit to the project and/or to the applicant, and may also clarify what resources or services the applicant might need to commit to the entity. We recognize that letters of commitment are not always considered formal agreements between two parties, but it is important to show the evaluation committee that the terms of these important partnerships have been clarified. It increases our confidence in the Hub-and-Spoke network being proposed and shows how the network will be sustained in the long-term.

Q18: Can grant funds be used to analyze the feasibility of constructing a multi-stream composting operation?

A18: RREO grant funds may be requested to fund feasibility studies for a particular project idea. You would be encouraged to include a plan for implementation as part of the scope of your feasibility study, even if implementation would not occur during the grant cycle. Note that any proposed study would be considered a Tier 3 project.

Q19: We are currently seeking funding to responsibly discard of hazardous waste. Is this grant program a good fit for us?

A19: Projects that focus solely on the proper disposal of hazardous waste would not be eligible for this funding opportunity.

Q20: Are any points awarded for areas of the state that has not received an RREO grant in the past?

A20: Points are not necessarily assigned based on areas of the state that have or have not received RREO funding in the past. Points are awarded, however, based on whether the project develops new local or regional infrastructure in an underserved area of the state.

Q21: Are letters of commitment only required for hub-and-spoke applications? Are letters of support adequate for Tier 2 & 3 projects?

A21: Letters of commitment are only required for Hub-and-Spoke projects. Letters of support are sufficient for Tier 2 and Tier 3 projects.

Q22: Please clarify how letters of commitment can meet the requirements of the RFA for hubs that will be developed at least in part based on successful grant award & whose ultimate operational schedule & pricing cannot be finalized until the awarded project is underway?

A22: The most important element of a letter of commitment is a description of the resources and/or services that will be dedicated to the successful implementation of the Hub-and-Spoke network and its long-term sustainability. Operational schedule and pricing are not as important as a confirmation from the spoke(s) committing to send their materials to the hub, outlining who will be responsible for hauling materials and any other pertinent information related to the partnership. The hub could also have its own letter of commitment with its spoke(s), confirming the equipment it will have available to assist in unloading, whether the hub has a truck scale and be able to provide accurate weights, etc. Since a letter of commitment is not a legally binding document, if the project is not funded and the hub not established, there is no obligation that the terms outlined in the letter of commitment must be fulfilled. We would hope that if the project is funded, the terms in the letter of commitment would be used as the basis of a service contract between the hub and spoke(s).

Q23: Can I apply for the purchase of a baler?

A23: Yes.

Q24: Could grant funds be used to fund a partially open product storage building?

A24: Yes, funding could be used to erect a partially open or three-sided building to process and store recyclables.

Q25: Is it better to apply for only one piece of equipment at a time?

A25: This question is a bit difficult to answer since it largely depends on what the needs of the applicant are. We have funded projects that run the spectrum, from applicants requesting funding for only a single baler all the way to funding the equipment and building materials for an entire recycling center.

Q26: The scoring system for proposals focuses mainly on project implementation and ours at this point is only for planning. While we intend to address the rating criteria as best we can, we were wondering if the committee would take this into account in reviewing the merits of our proposal.

A26: Planning studies would be eligible and considered a Tier 3 proposal. Though it may not score as high as a Tier 1 or Tier 2 project, the selection committee will take this into account during the review process.

Q27: Does it make a difference at this point if we are not the recycling operator, but have local support to move ahead with the Tier 3 planning request? Will letters of support suffice, or must we utilize letters of commitment?

A27: Letters of commitment are only required for Hub-and-Spoke proposals. Planning studies can provide letters of support and that will be sufficient.

Q28: Have any parameters been set to estimate the volumes of various materials needed to support a Hub operation and to support new jobs?

A28: No, as there are many variables that determine the economic feasibility of a hub, many of which are highly localized to where the hub will be sited. The applicant should plan on conducting research to determine how to make a hub economically feasible and provide that information in the proposal's narrative.

Q29: Is Attachment #2 for the Work Plan Format supposed to cover everything on the work plan, or do we need to cover more detail in the unstructured pages of the narrative?

A29: Yes, Attachment #2 is the sole document needed to build the project's work plan. You may reference items in Attachment #2 in the proposal's narrative.

Q30: The insurance requirements describe a necessity for Commercial General Liability insurance. Since we are applying for a Tier 3 project, and we are not purchasing equipment, will we need this type of insurance?

A30: It should be assumed that all grantees will need to carry the minimum insurance coverage as required by department policy. In special circumstances, a waiver may be requested during contract negotiations. Proof of insurance is not required to apply for a grant.

Q31: Can we build the cost of Commercial General Liability into the project budget?

A31: Applicants may request indirect funds to help cover the cost of administering the grant project.

Q32: What contributions can be qualified as "in-kind"? I.e. volunteers, office space, etc.

A32: Matching or in-kind contributions do not include existing personnel, facilities, etc. Only new spending directly related to this project should be included as in-kind matching.

Q33: Will a worker safety plan be necessary for our Tier 3 project?

A33: No. Worker safety plans are only necessary for implementation projects.

Q34: Can a nonprofit negotiate an indirect cost rate with CDPHE?

A34: A nonprofit may include an indirect cost rate in their project budget, but the total dollar amount cannot exceed 20% of the total project budget. The department will not negotiate a rate higher than 20%.

Questions Asked During the Bidders Meeting

Q35: Regarding indirect costs, please clarify what costs can be negotiated with the department.

A35: Applicants are free to include an indirect rate in their project budget at a rate they feel is appropriate so long as it does not exceed 20% of the total project budget. This cost will be considered reasonable relative to the project's overall budget. The department will not negotiate an indirect rate and will not accept an indirect rate higher than 20% of the total project budget.

Q36: We are seeking to implement a Hub-and-Spoke network in a rural County. The spokes we would develop are in unincorporated communities under the jurisdiction of the County. Since letters of commitment need to come from other legal entities, what would be acceptable to the committee? Also, would this be considered a Hub-and-Spoke project?

A36: The committee would be looking for letters of commitment from community groups in each of the unincorporated areas to verify that the spokes are needed and to outline what resources they will provide to maintain the spoke. The key to any Hub-and-Spoke network is to implement a regional solution to collecting recyclables, realizing economies of scale that will sustain the recycling program in the long-term. It appears this project idea would achieve that goal.

Q37: Please define what is meant by providing local incentives under Tier 2.

A37: The intent of the RREO grant program is to expand access to recycling, whether that means providing a new service in an underserved area of the state or developing a local end market for recyclables. Establishing these services provides a local incentive to increase recycling in the region.

Q38: Can letters of commitment be submitted after the application deadline?

A38: No, the application must be complete at the time it is submitted.

Q39: Can letters of support be included as a substitute if letters of commitment are not possible to secure by application deadline?

A39: Yes, letters of support will be accepted. Though letters of support are not as specific as to what resources an entity will commit to a Hub-and-Spoke network, and will make it difficult for the evaluation committee to determine the sustainability of a proposed Hub-and-Spoke network, it would at least confirm their interest in participating.

Q40: Are the letters of commitment included in the 12-page limit?

A40: No, they are included in the appendix.

Q41: For compost projects, it is difficult to report a cost per ton figure, as requested on the cover sheet. Compost is typically measured in volume, not weight. Will cost per cubic yard, for instance, be an acceptable substitute?

A41: Listing cost per cubic yard for compost projects would be acceptable.

Q42: A school district is looking to establish a Hub-and-Spoke network for e-waste recycling within a particular County. Is this eligible as Hub-and-Spoke?

A42: Yes, since the emphasis of Hub-and-Spoke is regionalization. The application would need to clearly define the spokes and the hub.

Q43: What Hub-and-Spoke supporting documentation would be acceptable, in addition to the letters of commitment?

A43: Memorandums of Understanding, contracts, and intergovernmental agreements would all be acceptable.

Q44: Can grant funds be used to cover transportation costs?

A44) No.

Q45: Some of our spokes will be in another state. The hub will be in Colorado. How should this be addressed in a Hub-and-Spoke application?

A45: The RREO Program can only fund projects developed in Colorado. Though it is encouraged to take a regional approach to develop a Hub-and-Spoke network, grant funds could only be used to develop the hub and the spokes within Colorado. The evaluation committee would like to see projected waste diversion from the out-of-state spokes in the application, but it is preferable to keep the data separate so that the committee can see how much of the project focuses on recycling beyond Colorado's borders versus within Colorado.

Q46: Would a secondary process used to extract materials from single-stream recyclables be considered a Tier 1 project? The project would set-up single-stream drop-off sites in a region so that materials could be funneled to a single-stream recycling processing center.

A46: As described, it would qualify as Tier 1 since the single-stream recycling center would be considered the hub and the drop-off centers would be the spokes.

Q47: If a Hub-and-Spoke network already exists, can grant funds be used to retrofit a hub? Can letters of commitment from existing clients be accepted?

A47: Yes, if the application can show that a modified hub will lead to increased recycling in the region. Letters of commitment from existing clients will be accepted.

Q48: Can Hub-and-Spoke focus on a single material?

A48: Yes. It is preferable that additional materials be collected, but Hub-and-Spoke applications that focus on a single material are acceptable.

Q49: Is this the first year the grant program has allowed e-waste recycling proposals?

A49: No, proposals focusing on e-waste have always been accepted. This is the first year e-waste proposals can be included in a Hub-and-Spoke network.

Q50: Can grant funds be used to fund a consultant to help get a product out for distribution?

A50: A grant proposal that asks solely to cover the cost of a consultant would not be eligible.

Q51: Can an applicant provide multiple budget options?

A51: Yes. If presenting multiple budget options, include additional columns in the budget table showing which line items would be funded by each option. Also, include cost per ton figures based on each budget option and list these in the appropriate section on the cover sheet.

Q52: Will the evaluation committee fund only specific items in a project budget?

A52: No, the committee will only fund the project budget as presented in the proposal.

Q53: How many projects were funded in the last grant cycle? What is the average grant award?

A53: The program funded nine projects in fiscal year 2014. The average grant award among all projects is approximately \$110,000.

Q54: What if an applicant does not fully expend their grant award?

A54: The funds roll-over into the next grant cycle.

Q55: Should grant proposals include jobs created based on calculations of predicted tons diverted or should only the actual jobs created be reported?

A55: The emphasis should be on actual jobs created. An applicant may include indirect job creation based on tons diverted in the application narrative, but the applicant should not include indirect jobs in the project's total jobs created figure.

Q56: When projecting job creation, how far into the future should the applicant predict?

A56: All jobs should be tied directly to the grant project, and all grant projects must be completed in the 12 month state fiscal year (July 1 - June 30). Applicants may project one

additional year if the implementation of the project is not likely to be fully complete until the end of the 12 month period.

Q57: Is there a minimum font size?

A57: Yes, 11 point type.

Q58: How many applications were received in the last grant cycle? Of those, how many were considered Tier 1 project?

A58: Approximately 35 grant proposals were received in the last grant cycle. The running average of Tier 1 projects for the grant program for last few grant cycles has been roughly 50%.

Q59: Is double-sided printing preferable?

A59: Yes, but only if a hard copy of the application will be submitted. It is the grant program's preference that applications be submitted electronically.

Q60: Can an applicant propose a phased feasibility study?

A60: Yes.

Q61: Since pilot projects are not looked on favorably, what is the committee's opinion on new business ventures?

A61: The grant program has a history of funding new business ventures. Since the new business doesn't have a track record, the committee carefully considers the feasibility of the business model and feasibility of successful implementation. If the grant project is a new program being instituted by an existing company with a long history, that is also acceptable and will be considered based on the resources the company will dedicate toward the project to guarantee its success.

Q62: Is sustainability of the project an important piece of a project proposal?

A62: Yes. Points are awarded based on how well an application addresses the project's long-term sustainability.

Q63: Our proposal would involve prisons. Does the committee consider incarcerated individuals an underserved population?

A63: Yes.

Q64: Is there a formula available to allow an applicant to calculate indirect jobs based on tons diverted?

A64: Yes. Applicants are encouraged to review the [recycling economic impact study](#) posted on the department's website for guidance.

Q65: Should jobs created from construction activity related to the grant project be included?

A65: These jobs would be considered indirectly related to the project. Jobs reported should be directly tied to the project itself. You may explain any indirect jobs created, but only jobs this project will sustain as a result of it being implemented will be the jobs figure the committee will reference in their evaluation.

Q66: If an applicant will be partnering with another entity with the intent to share some of the equipment purchased with grant funds, is this allowed by the grant program?

A66: Yes. Applicants are encouraged to exercise caution in any arrangements made with a third party. The department is contractually tied to the applicant only, so the applicant would be responsible for ensuring the other entity is using the equipment in a manner that will achieve the project's goals and objectives. The applicant holds all liability for any equipment lent or given to another entity. At the end of the contract, ownership rights of any equipment purchased with grant funds are transferred to the applicant. The department encourages that any agreement between the applicant and the other entity clearly define who will continue to operate and own the equipment.

Q67: Please define beneficial reuse.

A67: The department maintains [several links](#) to the pertinent regulations that define beneficial reuse. Beneficial reuse of materials in a landfill would not be looked upon favorably since the grant program is dedicated to funding projects that divert materials from the landfill.

Q68: Would curbside recycling service be considered a Tier 2 project?

A68: Yes.

Q69: Is a curbside collection route considered a spoke?

A69: No. A spoke would consist of a recycling drop-off center.

Q70: Can the committee share any common mistakes they typically see in a grant application?

A70: Be sure to abide by the page limit. Tier 1 projects are allowed 12 pages, Tier 2 and 3 projects are allowed 10 pages (including the cover sheet). Be sure to fully address all sections in the application narrative. Double-check all budget figures. Include a recent version of the Letter of Good Standing from the Secretary of State's website.

Q71: In Attachment #2, is there a limit on the number of activities and sub-activities that can be included?

A71: No, there is no limit.

Q72: Are letters of support considered an attachment in the appendix?

A72: Yes

Q73: Can equipment I donate to one or more entities be considered an in-kind match? Can equipment that is already on order be considered an in-kind contribution?

A73: Yes, the donation would be considered an in-kind match if the entity receiving the donated equipment will play a role in the project's implementation. Additionally, if new equipment that is on order and it is pertinent to the project's implementation, then it may be included as a match. Note that the grant program does not require a certain level of in-kind contributions relative to the project budget; however, applications that dedicate matching funds to the project will score more favorably.

Q74: If existing equipment will be used to implement the project, can that equipment be considered an in-kind match?

A74: No because in-kind contributions must be linked to new spending that would not occur if the grant project were not implemented.

Q75: Can additional sources of funding, such as other grant funds, be referenced in the grant application? If these additional funds are not yet approved, should they be included as an in-kind match?

A75: Additional sources of funding can be referenced in the project budget, but explain in the budget narrative whether the additional funds are already confirmed or if confirmation is still pending.

Q76: Can grant funds be used to expand a collection network among various retail centers in Colorado for a single material?

A76: If the approach is regional, then yes.

Q77: Do the spoke locations need to be identified in the application?

A77: It is preferable that the general location of each spoke be known at the time the application is submitted, though it is not necessary to know the exact address if that has yet to be determined.

Q78: Can grant funds be used to implement a new recycling process?

A78: Yes. If the process is proprietary or is considered sensitive business information, note that any information the department receives from a grantee is public record and the department is obligated to share information about your project if requested.

Q79: Explain why the Hub-and-Spoke requirements were expanded this year to include compost.

A79: Previous applications have focused on other materials and included elements of the Hub-and-Spoke model. Since the committee was seeing a demand from applicants to take Hub-and-Spoke beyond traditional recyclables (paper and containers), it made sense to meet that demand and modify the scope of the Request for Applications document.

Q80: Is there a way to send feedback to the committee about the grant program? Is there a way rural Colorado can be represented on the committee?

A80: Feedback is always welcome. All comments can be sent to cdphe.ppp2@state.co.us. Please visit the department's website for a [complete list of the committee's members](#). Statute requires that we have at least two seats that serve as a voice for rural Colorado, and there are six seats on the committee that can be filled by a representative of a for-profit business or nonprofit group from anywhere in Colorado.

Q81: For proposals focused on electronics recycling, what level of experience does the committee require from an applicant?

A81: The committee carefully scrutinizes proposals focused on e-waste recycling due to the potential of e-waste being recycled improperly. The committee gives preference to recyclers who have been certified to R2 or e-Stewards standards. Key personnel would need training and experience handling e-waste. A discussion on end markets is also required in the applications. The committee will also consider compliance history with applicable laws and regulations.

Q82: Are other state agencies eligible to apply? Are there any extra steps that have to be taken if another state agency is awarded a grant?

A82: Yes other state agencies are eligible. There are no additional administrative steps if awarded a grant. The only difference is that the insurance requirements would not apply.

Q83: For e-waste proposals, how specific does an applicant need to be explaining how they demanufacture the equipment they accept for recycling?

A83: The specific demanufacturing process employed is not required in the application narrative. It is more important to emphasize your downstream markets and your compliance history.

Conclusion

Eric concluded the bidders meeting by reminding everyone in attendance that the questions and answers discussed today will be posted on the CDPHE website in the near future. An email will be sent out notifying applicants the minutes are available for review. Questions will continue to be answered via phone and email through February 18 at 3:00 PM.

The bidders meeting ended at 11:30 AM.