



CITY OF PACIFIC
Office of City Clerk/Personnel Manager
100 3rd Avenue SE, Pacific, WA 98047
(253) 929-1105
(253) 939-6026 Fax

ADDENDUM TO RFP DOCUMENTS

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL: Solid Waste Services for the City of Pacific

ADDENDUM NO.: 2

DATE: April 30, 2015

To All Potential Bidders:

This addendum is issued to modify the previously issued bid documents and/or given for informational purposes, and is hereby made a part of the bid documents. Please attach this addendum to the documents in your possession. *Per the RFP, in the executive summary or cover letter, the proposer shall confirm receipt of any RFP addenda received and considered during the development of the proposal.*

All addenda will be posted on the City of Pacific website.

Questions submitted for clarification:

1. On page 2 of the RFP, the existing system refers to mandatory collection for residences and businesses (Section 1.2). Our assumption is that service will continue to be mandatory within these sectors in your new system. Is this correct?

Yes, for garbage only. Recycle and yard waste will be by subscription to commercial and recycle will be imbedded into residential and multifamily residential and yard debris will be imbedded into residential and by subscription to multifamily. Recycle and yard waste is not mandatory but there will be no price break for those who do not participate where it is imbedded into the garbage fee.

2. On page 7 of the RFP, the Customer Sector chart refers to 'Can' service within the Multifamily and Commercial Sector. Does the City wish to have Proponents offer can services (customer provided) for garbage at multifamily and commercial locations, or does the City's new system intend to have carts for all sectors (company provided)?

The intent is for the garbage collection contractor to provide the containers for

collection but we understand there may be exceptions in some cases where the use of compactors by the customer is in place to reduce the footprint on site.

3. On page 10, section D of the RFP; our understanding is that the City intends to assure that Multifamily locations are offered a minimum 48 gallons recycling service, per unit, weekly; however if the service provider provided 96-gallons every other week recycling service per unit to a Multifamily location, this would be adequate. Additionally, our assumption continues in the following scenario: If there was a 20 unit Multifamily property, they would then need to have a minimum provided recycling service of 960 gallons recycling per week, or 1,920 gallons of recycling every-other week. 1 cubic yard is equivalent to 204 gallons (approx), so by this logic the service provider would need to offer a range of recycling between 4.7 cubic yards per week, or 9.41 cubic yards recycling every-other-week. Are our assumptions and logic matching the City's intent on this section correct? If we are not correct, is there additional clarification that could be offered in this area?

Yes, the assumption is correct. However, as stated throughout the RFP the customer may choose to reduce the size to be collected voluntarily but this will not result in a price break. The expectation is that the contractor will work with each multifamily complex owner to determine the needs for that complex and the options that the contractor can provide. Many of our multifamily complexes do not recycle and the City would like them to consider doing so to possibly reduce the amount of garbage being collected thereby possibly reducing the container size to be collected as garbage and reducing their bill that way.

4. On page 17 of the RFP, within section C1, there is language that states the Proponent 'would implement automated residential collection **if** the City elected to proceed with that option.' Our assumption is that the City's intent is to assure that all residential customers would get automated collection, and that there would be no more can services for residential customers. Is this assumption correct?

Yes

5. On page 20 of the RFP, within section 3.2 there is reference that the page numbers 'must be placed in the upper right-hand corner of each such page and sub-lettered to correspond with the page to which the information pertains.' Would it be acceptable for a proposal which is submitted bound, where for visibility purposes, page-numbers and sub-lettering always appeared on the outer-most edge of the page; in the lower corner?

Yes

6. In the new system, does the City intend to have Proponents apply the franchise

fee of 3% on each customer's bill separate from the monthly rate (which is how the utility tax is referred to on page 8, section B.2). Or, should the 3% franchise fee be applied into the unit price for each service?

The 3% franchise fee is a fee charged on the gross receipts collected by the provider and should be factored in when establishing the rates.

7. If the 3% franchise fee is applied into the unit price for each service, does this 3% count towards the final unit price cap on a 35-40 gallon cart of \$23.60?

Yes

8. Our assumption is that the state's 3.6% refuse tax, as well as the King County hazardous waste fee, would continue to be itemized separately on customer bills, and not be included in the unit price, as is the current practice in King County. Is this assumption correct?

The only tax or fee that is not included in the base 35-40 gallon cart fee of \$23.60 is the City of Pacific's utility tax. The contractor may itemize the other fees and taxes in the billing if they choose to but the total of all of those fees and taxes minus the City's utility tax must be less than or equal to \$23.60.

9. Will the attached **PROPOSAL SECURITY (proposal bond)** be acceptable as modified?

Yes

10. In the **PROPOSAL SECURITY** form (page 23) and **Form 3 IDENTIFICATION OF PERFORMANCE SECURITY** (Page 25) Performance Security is shown as a requirement. However, we could not find the actual requirements of the PERFORMANCE SECURITY. If PERFORMANCE SECURITY is provided in the form of a **Performance Bond** it is Industry standard that the **Performance Bond** be on an annually renewable form (Sample attached) in the amount of one year's estimated billing. Will this be acceptable **Performance Security**?

Yes

11. On page 7 of the RFP, the proposal mentions that 'contractor fees provided by the bidder shall incorporate the following elements, and be based on actual cost of service.' Below this statement the chart refers to cart costs being embedded in the rates, and a cost-of-service formula being used for the rate. Does the rate Proposal submitted by proponents need to show details for each rate, such as the formula used or cart costs embedded in rates, or is a simple rate proposal showing the overall rate being billed to customers by service level sufficient?

Yes

12. Will a format similar to the attached PDF be sufficient for each level of service in the rate proposal? If not, is there an example format the City could send to Proponents to submit rates on?

Yes

13. To remain consistent with service expectations elsewhere in the RFP, did the City intend to reference that multifamily rates should include garbage and recycling?

The Multifamily/Commercial Can, Cart and Detachable Container customer sector asks for rates to “include and exclude container costs.” Typically rates in this sector are inclusive of the container costs as customers are not permitted to procure their own carts or steel bin containers (due to safety and equipment compatibility concerns). Will the City strike “and excluding” from the Multifamily/Commercial line in the section 2.5 table?

Rate Table, Section 2.5 (excerpt):

Customer Sector	Include in Rates	Rate Formula
Multifamily/Commercial Can, Cart and Detachable Container	Garbage, including and excluding container costs	Cost-of-service

Yes

14. Waste Management has included a blank template for submitting a rate proposal. Will this be sufficient for the City’s use?

Simple rate structures should be used to prevent confusion. The formats that she has used in the past should be more than sufficient. We have no example format