

QUESTION: Here is our interpretation of what these entail. Please let us know if these assumptions are correct, or if you are looking for something else. Specifics would be greatly appreciated. Our finance person is also available by phone if clarifying this information is easier.

Attachment 3A

Base Bid – This is the bid form for 3 cart service with co-mingled organics (GW/FW). Can you confirm this is correct. Additionally we are to assume all organic material going to Palomar TS to a yet to be determined processing facility.

ANSWER: The base proposal should reflect collection of material in a green cart and delivery of that material to Palomar Transfer Station. Whether the material is green waste only or commingled organics should not impact the proposed costs for collection. Collection proposers are required to propose an organics processing facility/option, which may or may not require transfer. If the proposer is recommending a direct-haul option to a processing facility (as opposed to transfer through Palomar), the savings resulting from the direct-haul should be reflected in Attachment 3C as a “Cost Saving Proposal”.

Attachment 3B

1383 Bid – Is this the form for the four cart service with GW/FW being source separated and hauled to separate processing facilities for both organics waste streams?

- If so, the Excel sheet is identical to 3A where there is only data entry for co-mingled organics. If this is the case, we are calculating the costs for each waste stream separately and combining them into the “organics” data entry cells?
- Or, is this for only MSW, RCY and GW services with no food waste included? If this is the case, see below in 3C questions.

ANSWER: The SB 1383 proposal should reflect a commingled organics (as defined in the Draft Agreement, Attachment A, “Organic Materials”) program collected in a green container. The SB 1383 proposal should also include all of contractor’s costs of complying with the new requirements of SB 1383 that are being delegated to the contractor through this agreement (e.g. contamination monitoring, material sampling, education and outreach, increased recordkeeping/reporting, etc.). The Excel file provided as Attachment 3B is NOT identical to Attachment 3A. The treatment of commingled organics collection is identical in the two attachments, however, the two attachments include material differences in rate structure in Forms 8-12. Proposers should not populate Attachment 3A and simply re-name it to match 3B and make subsequent changes as there are substantive differences between the files.

Attachment 3C

Alt Bid – Is this strictly for FW collection and processing? If that is the case, would that be combined with 3B, assuming that 3B is only for MSW, RCY and GW?

ANSWER: This form is to provide the City with the incremental additional costs of each of the alternate programs identified in the RFP Section 5.9 under items 3.1 through 3.10. Among the alternate proposals being requested is item 3.10 (4-Stream Collection). This are the columns to provide information about the incremental additional costs of providing a fourth container collection stream in the event that organics processing has to happen separately for food scraps and yard trimmings.