

Waste Characterization Study Request for Proposals Addendum

- In Exhibit A-Proposed Scope of Services primary objective number four is to “Further define and measure household hazardous waste disposed into the County waste stream as detailed in Task 2.” There doesn’t appear to be any further detail regarding HHW materials in Task 2. Can the Agency provide clarification regarding this objective?

Agency Response: The HHW material categories should be consistent with the categories used in the 2006-07 Waste Characterization Study. These categories include Paint, Vehicle & Equipment Fluids, Used Oil & Oil Filters, Large Rechargeable Batteries, Small Rechargeable Batteries, Household Batteries, Universal Waste, Covered Electronic Waste, Fluorescent Tubes, Other HHW, and Remainder/Composite Hazardous & Electronic Waste. Please see the category descriptions in that Waste Characterization Study for more detail of the material types included in those categories.

- Does the Agency know if haulers run their collections in such a way that only waste from a single customer “class” is collected on each route? For example, do the haulers run routes that only collect wholesale/retail/warehouse customers? Or are the routes comprised of many customers “classes” as is the standard practice?

Agency Response: Garbage routes are separated by sector (residential vs. commercial) and by geographic location. There are no routes devoted to specific classes of customers.

- Can the Agency detail what is meant by lumping/splitting material categories in the third bullet under task one?

Agency Response: If the contractor proposes to combine or split any material categories for the sake of efficiency or clarity, Agency staff must be involved in this decision from the beginning. Agency staff reserves the right to approve or disapprove of any proposals of this sort.

- The 2006 study jumped from facility to facility collecting and sorting samples. Can selected trucks be redirected to a single sampling and sorting facility?

Agency Response: Agency staff does not have the contractual ability to require trucks be diverted to a specific site for the purpose of this analysis. Requests can be made of the hauling companies, and perhaps even Agency members can make requests, but the proposers cannot rely on this being the case. A proposal identifying the efficiencies and cost savings through redirecting traffic to one facility would be helpful to Agency staff and could be used as justification for making the request if the cost savings are significant.

- What was the final cost of the previous 2006/07 Study completed by Cascadia Consulting?

Agency Response: \$101,500

- Who will be the reviewers evaluating the proposals received?

Agency Response: The review panel will include Henry Mikus and Patrick Carter, but the third member has not been selected at this point.

- Has the project manager for the study been identified, and will he/she be involved with the review of the proposals submitted?

Agency Response: Yes to both questions.

- Will interviews be held if several submittals attain similar high scores after review, and will this interview be scheduled before December 20th, 2013?

Agency Response: Please refer to Section 3.3 of the RFP for the Rights of the Agency. Interviews are typically scheduled shortly after Agency staff has had a chance to review the proposals. It is expected to occur prior to holiday vacations.