

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL “RFP” NO. PS20161089  
DEPOT TRANSFER AND LANDFILL OPERATIONAL REPOSITIONING REVIEW

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 3

ISSUED ON OCTOBER 20, 2016

Q1	The RFP PS20161089 for DEPOT, TRANSFER, AND LANDFILL OPERATIONAL REPOSITIONING REVIEW did not include Appendix 5 “Certificate of Existing Insurance” which is to be completed by our broker. Could you please provide.
A1	<b>Yes. Please see Addendum 1 for a copy of the City’s Insurance Form.</b>
Q2	<p>The RFP reflects that proposals will be evaluated according to the following weighting: 30% financial, 65% technical, and 5% corporate sustainability leadership. In this regard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Could you please elaborate further on how the 65% technical weighting will be assigned (e.g. weighting for team member’s experience, project manager’s experience, case histories of similar projects, references, etc.)?</li> <li>b. Could you please identify how the 30% financial weighting will be applied (e.g. does the lowest bid receive full marks and the highest bid zero, absolute difference in price, etc.)?</li> </ul>
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. In Section 8.2 high level weighting is provided on the basis of which the City will evaluate proposals. Also contained in Section 8.2 is a list of criteria upon which the City will evaluate the proposals. This is the City’s standard approach for disclosing the evaluation weighting, further breakdown is not available.</li> <li>b. Per the above the City’s standard is to provide high level summaries of evaluation criteria, no further breakdown is available.</li> </ul>
Q3	In our experience, the setting and application of evaluation criteria can be a very time consuming process where there are multiple stakeholders (even in the same organization) with varying political and economic agendas. In order to provide a level playing field for bidders, can the City please clarify their expectations as to how this process will be managed in Parts II and III of the project?
A3	<b>The City will review the submitted workplans across all Parts of the project in a holistic manner in accordance with the criteria listed in Part A - Section 8.2.</b>
Q4	There appears to be significant potential for overlap between the initiatives that may be considered for evaluation in Part II and in Part III of the project. Can the City please clarify the fundamental distinction between the types of initiatives to be considered in

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL “RFP” NO. PS20161089  
DEPOT TRANSFER AND LANDFILL OPERATIONAL REPOSITIONING REVIEW**

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 3**

	each Part?
A4	The Depot, Transfer and Landfill businesses are part of an integrated system. As a result, the potential ‘initiatives’ that may be considered in Part II (Landfill/Material Diversion) and Part III (Depot and Transfer) may be mutually exclusive of each other and/or inter-related. Some key distinctions that may impact the potential ‘initiatives’ between Phase II and III pertain to location(s), physical infrastructure/facilities, materials managed, services provided, stakeholders involved, etc. The City is supportive of beneficially integrated ‘initiatives’ as well as suggestions in a proponents workplan that will reduce potential overlap of work between phases.