

City of Kirkland
Solid Waste Collection RFP Addendum #3
April 12, 2021

Notice:

This Addendum 3 provides a summary of answers to the eight questions received from Proposers during the first round of questions and answers.

Issued April 12, 2021

Greg Piland
Financial Operations Manager

Addendum 3: Round 1 Questions and Answers
City of Kirkland
Solid Waste RFP and Contract
April 12, 2021

#	Document	Section(s)	Hauler	Question/Comment	Response	Action
1	RFP	Form 2	Recology	<p>Form 2 – Alternatives: We appreciate that the City is giving proposers an opportunity to offer more cost-effective and environmentally friendly fuel alternative in Alternative 1. We also recognize that, per item #8 in Appendix D: IR Comments and Responses, the City is planning to score the base proposal as well as any alternatives.</p> <p>However, we still have some concerns with the City’s decision to require CNG vehicles as a base proposal. This decision gives the incumbent a significant cost advantage in the Base Proposal. This is because only the incumbent has nearby CNG infrastructure in place; other proposers will not prior to contract inception. All other proposers will have capital requirements and regulatory hurdles associated with increasing CNG capacity, thereby disadvantaging their Base Proposals.</p> <p>While we appreciate the City’s decision to include alternative fuels as an Alternative, we ask that the City will once more consider amending the RFP to allow alternative fuels in place of CNG for the Base Proposal</p>	<p>The City still prefers a fleet of CNG collection vehicles in the base contract and this requirement is fundamentally contributory to aiding the City achieve its long-term emissions reduction goals stated in the Sustainability Master Plan. The City is very much open to considering a fleet of alternatively fueled vehicles as an alternative in the RFP and is looking forward to considering proposals for the fleet alternative.</p> <p>While it is recognized that some Proposers may have elected to make investments in CNG infrastructure in the past, the City’s preference for CNG collection vehicles is not intended to provide the incumbent Contractor or any other potential Proposer with a cost advantage. Any past or current independent decision made by the incumbent or any Proposer to make a capital investment in CNG fueling infrastructure is outside of the City’s control.</p>	None.
2	RFP	Section 2.4	Recology	<p>This section notes that “the City may, at its option, allow a second round of questions.” This is again echoed in Appendix D: IR Comments and Responses, item 10. Has the City determined whether it would allow for a second round of questions between April 5th and May 17th? As we further assess costs and logistics and visually review the city, we expect that we will have additional questions as we delve deeper into the RFP.</p>	<p>The City will offer the opportunity for a second round of questions pursuant to Section 2.4 of the RFP. Questions are due on April 19, 2021 by 4:30 PM PST. Answers will be posted on or about April 26, 2021. Please note that the questions in the second round shall be limited to clarifications on answers provided during the first round of questions.</p>	Second round of questions added to the process.
3	Contract	Section 4.2.1	Recology	<p>We would like to ask a follow up question from our initial Item 64 in Appendix D: IR Comments and Responses, to better clarify our original question. Section 4.2.1 of the Contract includes an adjustment protocol in lines 24 to 27. However, the CPI does not publish a 12-month number ending June 30th. Therefore, we believe the City intends this protocol to be based on the point in time figure for June. Can you clarify?</p>	<p>The annual CPI escalator is based upon the 12-month June-to-June CPI-W, ending June 30 which is published on or about each July 15 by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.</p>	None.
4	RFP	Form 2	Recology	<p>Form 2 allows proposers to state their own “extra” cost for service. We recommend the City “hard-code” a cost for extra service (which other cities have done recently in their RFPs), as opposed to leaving it open to proposers. This will prevent</p>	<p>The cost to collect extras or provide ancillary services may vary slightly by Proposer. The table in the Form 2 section of the RFP is prefaced with the requirement the states “Contractor fees provided by the Proposer on Form 2 shall incorporate the</p>	None.

#	Document	Section(s)	Hauler	Question/Comment	Response	Action
				proposers from over-charging for extras and subsidizing lower monthly base prices. This would improve customer service and reduce calls to the City by reducing incentives for a contractor to aggressively pursue and charge for extras.	following elements and be based on actual cost of service.” to prevent Proposers from over-charging for extras and subsidizing rates in other sectors. The City expects Proposers to abide by the request for cost-of-service rates.	
5	Contract		Recology	Item 9 in Appendix D: IR Comments and Responses: Because carts and containers are a large upfront capital investment, we just want to confirm that all proposals should assume that customers will continue to use their existing rolling carts (and therefore the contractor would only purchase an inventory of replacement carts to address normal cart attrition). Should proposers also assume purchasing all new metal containers for the start of the contract (including the incumbent)?	<p>Yes, per the answer provided for Item 9 in the industry review table, Proposers should assume that customers will continue to use their existing carts.</p> <p>The contract does not require all new metal containers at the start of the contract. If a Proposer other than the incumbent is awarded the contract, the Proposer will be given the opportunity to purchase the incumbent Contractor’s in-place Detachable Containers and Drop-Box Containers per the terms described below. However, such Proposer is not obligated to purchase said containers and may opt to instead propose all new metal containers at the start of the contract. If the incumbent is the successful Proposer, the City intends to retain and continue to use the metal containers in place at the start of the new contract.</p> <p>The language from Kirkland’s expiring contract with Waste Management is provided below:</p> <p><i>“On the termination of this Contract for any reason, the City may, at its option, purchase or assign the right to purchase the Contractor’s in-place inventory of Detachable Containers or Drop-Box Containers for use by the successive contractor. In the event that Contractor’s Containers are purchased or assigned, the sale price shall equal fifty percent (50%) of the average new price for each Container, based on the average price from three (3) manufacturers at the time of the termination. For the purposes of this transaction, the average prices shall include transportation from the manufacturer to the Contractor’s closest service yard but shall exclude sales or use taxes.”</i></p>	Clarification provided.
6	Contract		Recology	Does the City have a flow diagram, detailed explanation or sample files they can share that illustrates how the City of Kirkland’s customer management system and WM’s system currently exchange information related to billing? Specifically: a. How is the data exchanged between the two systems (i.e., flat file, API, etc.)? b. Is there a file exchange through SFTP? If so, will the City of Kirkland or the contractor host the SFTP site? c. What is the data exchange cadence (daily, weekly, monthly)? d. How do bill adjustments, credits flow through the system?	<p>A. Each week, the current vendor e-mails:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Separate Excel files that summarize the residential garbage cart size changes and credits given to customers for incorrect charges (mostly for garbage/yard waste extras) 2) Garbage/yard waste extras are sent via .csv files separately for each Kirkland billing cycles <p>Commercial/multifamily charges are sent via e-mail via text file from the Contractor each month. A separate file is sent for each Kirkland billing cycle.</p>	None.

#	Document	Section(s)	Hauler	Question/Comment	Response	Action
				e. Will customers have service suspended due to late/insufficient payments? If so, how is that information sent to the contractor?	<p>B. The City does not use an SFTP site for this exchange of information.</p> <p>C. Residential cart size changes, credits, and fees for garbage/yard waste extras are e-mailed weekly. Commercial/multifamily charges are e-mailed monthly.</p> <p>D. The customer will call the contractor directly. The contractor will determine whether awarding a credit is warranted. Approved credits are compiled and e-mailed to the City as an Excel file weekly. The City then inputs this information directly into its billing software.</p> <p>E. Garbage collection service is mandatory in Kirkland and the City does not suspend service due to insufficient payments. If unpaid balances accumulate over multiple billings, the City may file a lien on the property against the owner.</p>	
7	Contract		Recology	If the City is going to maintain residential billing and the Contractor will maintain MF/commercial, how will the revenue for residential accounts flow to the Contractor?	<p>To clarify, single family residential, multifamily, and commercial customers will continue to be billed by the City.</p> <p>Please see Question 6. Each month, the City sends residential container counts by container size to the Contractor, so the Contractor can accurately invoice the City each month.</p>	None.
8			Republic	Would it be possible to receive the current container counts and service levels for commercial and roll-off recycling for 2020 and 2021 YTD?	Yes. The container counts and service levels for multifamily and commercial roll-off recycling services will be provided in an addendum.	Data to be provided via an addendum.