

The City of Alexandria
2018 2nd Request for Proposals (RFP)
Municipal Solid Waste Disposal Services
Potential Respondents' Questions and the City's Answers

General

1. Please confirm the correct timelines. Pages 1 & 2 of the RFQ document dated August 7th conflicts with Pages 1 & 8 from RFP document dated August 6th.

The RFQ and RFP are separate tasks within one initiative with related but independent deliverables; the timelines do not fully coincide for a reason. The RFQ timeline, as explained in the in-person Q & A conference, addresses the City's construction of the facility; the RFP addresses use of that facility with private partnering in several options. The City confirms each timeline as correct.

2. Is it the City's intent to also receive cost proposals at the time that this RFQ/RFP is due?

Respondents should submit all information needed to allow the City to thoroughly review and evaluate each proposal on a similar basis. The cost of operation is of paramount importance in the evaluation phase.

3. In order for timely and effective response after the Q&A process, we respectfully request an extension of the due date of the RFQ/RFP to Friday, August 31st. If it is the City's intent to also receive cost proposals, we respectfully request the due date of the RFQ/RFP be extended to September 7th.

Per the live Q & A held on August 20th, the City has extended the RFP deadline to September 7th at 5 p.m.

4. Section 3.7.8.4 states Proposer shall contact the City Attorney for a method of orally disclosing whether a written disclosure is merited. Please advise if we should include such written disclosure in our response.

No. Only if your potential conflict includes the items in 3.7.8.4 (i.e. the four bullet points), then call the City Attorney and disclose it to determine whether you will be required to disclose it in writing with your RFP response. The other 3.7.8 disclosures should be in writing at the time of the response—i.e. transactions etc. The City does not wish to get into litigation matters unless the City attorney requires such a disclosure, as limited in 3.7.8.4.

5. The RFP refers to the transfer station as a Non-Processing Transfer Station, and the City Engineers RFQ refers to is as a Type IIA Processing Transfer Station. Please clarify if the transfer station will be classified as a Non-Processing Transfer Station or a Type IIA

Processing Transfer Station. This has a significant impact on the required permitting and applicable regulatory operating standards.

The City confirms its intent to construct a Non-Processing Transfer Station. Any reference to a Type IIA Processing Transfer Station and the EPA pro-forma layout were provided for illustrative purposes only—i.e. to show the physical facility layout not operational requirements.

6. If the City desires to permit a Type IIA transfer station, please identify the desired/expected “processing” activities.

The City does not desire to permit a new Type IIA transfer station.

7. Does the City intend for the transfer station to accept/separate and recycle household White Goods?

The City intends for the transfer station to accept household White Goods. Any decision concerning recycling is at the sole discretion of the operator. Potential respondents/operators are cautioned to not add activity on the site which could be classified as processing and require new or additional permitting not already contemplated herein.

8. Will municipal solid waste and commercial waste from other municipalities and parishes be allowed for acceptance at this transfer station? If so, what is the anticipated volume? Is the estimated 2,500 tons per month, as referenced on Page 3 of the RFQ, only City volume?

The City believes there are economies of scale to be captured by allowing municipal solid waste and commercial waste from other municipalities and parishes to be accepted at the City-owned transfer station. The 2,500 tons per month is an estimate of the City-generated and collected MSW only. The City has no estimate as to the mass of MSW which might originate waste from other municipalities or parishes.

9. The RFQ from the City Engineer states that “associated facilities will include truck scales, vehicle washing station and office space”. Is the vehicle/truck washing station mandatory?

It is the City’s intent to construct a transfer station utilizing the most currently accepted industry best practices. Preference will be given to respondents who meet this design goal.

10. The information provided indicates that public utilities, including a sewer connection, are available at the proposed location. A solid waste transfer station that includes a truck wash station will generate process wastewater in addition to typical sanitary waste water. Please provide confirmation that the POTW will accept the process waste waters from the transfer

station building and the truck wash station for treatment and discharge at the POTW. In addition, please identify any waste water pretreatment required prior to discharge to the POTW.

The POTW will accept the process waste waters from the transfer station building and the truck wash station for treatment and discharge at the POTW. Concerning pretreatment, waste water discharge should comply with Alexandria Code of Ordinances Chapter 27.5, Article VII.

11. How many firms responded with Letter of Intent?

The City has received two (2) Letters of Intent and two additional inquiries after the period for letters of intent.

12. Who will have final responsibility for proper disposal of white goods collected by the City's Sanitation Department?

As will all other MSW collected, the City will deliver white goods to the transfer station for disposal. It will be the responsibility of the transfer station operator to dispose of the white goods in accordance with all applicable laws, rules, regulations, and/or industry best practices.

13. Is it the City's expectation that the selected provider sort the waste for recyclable materials before disposal?

The selected operator may handle the waste in any manner that complies with all applicable laws, rules, regulations, and/or industry best practices. Potential operators are strongly reminded of the City's intent to construct as non-processing waste transfer station. Uses outside of that parameter may subject the site to additional permitting not contemplated in this RFP.

14. Is the City open to operation of a future, parallel recycling facility on the same site?

The selected operator may handle the waste in any manner that complies with all applicable laws, rules, regulations, and/or industry best practices. Potential operators are strongly reminded of the City's intent to construct as non-processing waste transfer station. Uses outside of that parameter may subject the site to additional permitting not contemplated in this RFP.

Option #3 – City built and privately managed

1. If this Option is selected, which party (owner or operator) will be responsible for all applicable solid waste and water permitting, including the applicable monitoring, recordkeeping and reporting obligations?

In the event of a City-constructed, privately managed facility, the City would expect the applicable monitoring, recordkeeping and reporting obligations be managed by the private manager.