

ADDENDUM No. 1

RFP No. 986

Operation of Drop Off Station

Due: November 3, 2016 at 2:00 P.M.

The following changes, additions, and/or deletions shall be made to the Request for Proposal for Operation of Drop Off Station RFP No. 986 on which proposals will be received on/or before November 3, 2016 by 2:00 P.M.

The information contained herein shall take precedence over the original documents and all previous addenda (if any), and is appended thereto. **This Addendum includes 4 page(s).**

Offeror is to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 1, including all attachments in its Proposal by so indicating in the proposal that the addendum has been received. Proposals submitted without acknowledgement of receipt of this addendum will be considered nonconforming.

The following forms provided within the RFP Document must be included in submitted proposal:

- City of Ann Arbor Non-Discrimination Ordinance Declaration of Compliance
- City of Ann Arbor Living Wage Ordinance Declaration of Compliance
- Vendor Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form

Proposals that fail to provide these completed forms listed above upon proposal opening will be deemed non-responsive and will not be considered for award.

I. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question #1: On p.13 it states the operational hours upon signing the contract are “Tues and Thurs, 8:30am to 6:00pm”- however, currently the Tues/Thurs hours at the Drop-Off Station are 8:30am-6:30pm. Is this an actual suggested change in operational hours for the Tues/Thurs days of the Drop-Off Station? Additionally, over the past few years, the DOS has had Monday hours during the summer months – is this no longer being considered?

Answer #1: Proposers must include the proposed operating hours. Proposers have the option of changing hours as stated in the RFP, page 13 Operating Hours, “The Contractor will provide City a minimum of one week written notification for any changes in operating hours for City owned or Contractor owned drop off station.” In addition, a Proposer may propose alternative methods/approaches and the merits of this proposal will be considered by the City during the review of the proposal.

Question #2: On p. 12 under “general public” it states that “customers from the City of Ann Arbor will receive equal or better treatment (include rates) than non-city customers...” It is unclear how this can be achieved, monitored and measured, particularly if all customers are treated well and fairly. The best an operator can do is equal treatment, so how should “better” be defined? Do you have examples? As for pricing, is the City expecting a different pricing structure for City residents? Given that the DOS has been a regional facility and only 40% - 50% of customers are City residents, what is the justification for City residents to have different, presumably lower, pricing for the same service?

Answer #2: As included in the RFP, the proposer is to provide equal or better treatment (including rates) to City Customers. As the facility is City-owned and repairs are paid for solely by the City, this is a condition of the City’s existing operations contract, and will continue to be included in these operations.

Question #3: The current RFP does not allow the storage of materials on-site for more than 3 months, requiring materials to be shipped every quarter. What is the purpose of this requirement, particularly if storage does not exceed MDEQ requirements or break any other guidelines? Such a requirement by the City can greatly, and unnecessarily, increase transportation costs and environmental impact due to partial loads.

Answer #3: The Proposer is not to store material speculatively; material is not to be stored for an indeterminate period of time.

Question #4: The RFP requires material (including motor oil and antifreeze) delivered to the site to be emptied into a proper DOT storage container by the end of each work day. What is the justification for this requirement? Oil/antifreeze can be stored in the barn in secondary/redundant containment allowing for “batch” processing which is much more cost effective and less labor intensive.

Answer #4: Proposers are not to store material in non-DOT approved containers, as good housekeeping practices must be in effect. Proposers are to provide a plan as identified in the RFP page 12, Storage of Materials.

Question #5: Materials of Acceptance: The RFP states that any changes to the list of Materials of Acceptance must be reviewed by the City. Will the City be able to deny changes, whether the changes are additions or deletions? Given that the DOS is a regional facility, how will the City reconcile the changes with the needs of regional customers? In the RFP, on page 14, there is a list of “Suggested” materials – if the City requires a review, and presumably control, of the accepted materials, is the list a *requirement* of the RFP or merely a *suggestion* as stated?

Answer #5: The Proposers must provide in their proposal a list of materials that under their work plan they will accept. To assist Proposers, the City provided a starting list of materials for consideration by Proposers in the RFP as the *Suggested Materials of Acceptance*. Following award of the operations contract, subsequent requests for additions or deletions of materials will not be unduly withheld, when properly requested by the Proposer.

Question #6: Materials of Acceptance: Some materials on the material list represent very modest revenue streams such as cardboard, metals, paper (which would require separation from the single stream/mixed recyclables in order for there to be positive value). Most of the materials on the list are a cost to the operator. If the City has control over the material list, there could be significant operational costs

placed upon the operator (e.g. if a revenue-generating material was dropped). How will the City work with the contractor should such a scenario arise?

Answer #6: As noted on page 10 of the RFP, under **Materials of Acceptance**, “The Contractor will determine, establish and collect any fee(s) necessary for each item accepted.” If the Contractor determines that due to operating costs adjustments need to be made to the materials accepted at the DOS, they may request those adjustments as described in the answer to question #5.

Question #7: Materials of Acceptance: Many more material acceptance programs have been introduced over the years, over and above what is on the “Suggested Materials of Acceptance” list, such as paint, mattresses, paper/hard drive shredding, tennis balls, etc. These programs have been a benefit to the residents of Ann Arbor (and beyond) and supported the overall waste diversion goals of the City of Ann Arbor. If these materials are included in a proposal as “materials of acceptance,” does the City then have the ability to remove/restrict collection of these materials even though they have been established and collected for years? What is the general practice then for the oversight, acceptance, and refusal of introducing waste diversion collection programs under this contract from the City of Ann Arbor’s view?

Answer #7: See answer to question #5.

Question #8: Tracking: Understanding the current physical and technological limitations of the site, detailed tracking of customers and materials seems virtually impossible operationally. The RFP as currently issued requires the tracking of material/customers for every City customer’s material weights (there is no scale on site), number of items by city address (e.g. two bags of newspapers, one bag of Styrofoam peanuts, etc.) and must provide this information to the city contract administrator on the monthly basis. Can the City provide the justification for such detail? The DOS serves upwards of 400 customers per day. The tracking required by the RFP would not only significantly increase operating costs unnecessarily, but also customer wait times. By annual survey, it could be determined what percentage of customers are City residents and what percentage are non-City residents – could these percentages be applied to outbound material shipments in order to estimate City material volumes/weights? Further, it seems unrealistic to expect customers to wait longer in the queue, causing potential back-up onto Ellsworth Road, and offer up personal information like names and addresses.

Answer #8: The Proposer is to provide a plan for tracking the amounts of materials brought to the DOS as requested in the RFP, see Tracking page 11. A Proposer may propose alternative methods/approaches and the merits of this proposal will be considered by the City during the review of the proposal.

Question #9: Tracking: The RFP states “The Contractor is also required to provide a quarterly and annual summary of City Weights and all activity, City residents and non-City Residents...” This suggests that same tracking required for City residents is required for non-City residents in order to provide the report requested. The DOS serves 30,000 customers annually. The same issues/concerns/questions remain here as they do in the immediate above question.

Answer #9: See answer to question #8

Question #10: Can the City please define “Uncontrollable Circumstances” a little further. How will it be determined if something is caused by an Uncontrollable Circumstance? If the site is on the landfill, that must include the onsite roads. Will the maintenance of the onsite roads, including grading and storm water flow, also be considered through the lens of Uncontrollable Circumstances rather than a strict contractor responsibility? It is more likely that issues with water flow, potholes, etc. are due to site/landfill issues rather than due to contractor-caused issues.

Answer #10: Maintenance of the on-site roads is not considered Uncontrollable Circumstances, see RFP page 11, Maintenance of Entrance Roads and Onsite Roads. The proposer is to provide a plan to address maintenance of the on-site roads.

Question #11: On page 13 of the WMI contract under Exhibit A-1 it lists equipment to be provided by WMI. It lists Roll-off Trucks and Containers as required. Roll off service provided under the current WMI contract or RFP 980 are not specifically identified. I was wondering if this was related to the RFP #986 “Operation of Drop Off Station” that was just issued?

Answer #11: RFP 980 and RFP 986 are not related RFPs.

Respondents are responsible for any conclusions that they may draw from the information contained in the Addendum.