Council Meeting Date: May 15, 2000 **Agenda Item: 6(b)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Review of Request For Proposals for Solid Waste Collection Services
DEPARTMENT:	City Manager's Office
PRESENTED BY:	Kristoff T. Bauer, Assistant to the City Manager

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

Residences and businesses in the City currently receive solid waste collection services from two separate providers formerly under Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC) regulation. Rabanco (Allied) serves eastern Shoreline while Waste Management serves western Shoreline. The City Council took action in August 1995, and subsequently with each annexation (Area B in Feb. 1997, Area A-3 in November 98, and Area A-2 in August 99) to provide continuation franchises to these providers. This act began the process of terminating the authority of these companies to provide service within the City under WUTC regulation. The statutory transition period for the first area (the initial incorporation boundary of the City) ends August 31, 2000. The purpose for this report is for Council to consider a Request For Proposal (RFP) process and document with the purpose of entering into a contract with a single provider for solid waste collection services for this entire area and extending eventually to the entire City.

The main objectives of the City to be accomplished through this process are to:

1. Give the City a role in ensuring the adequate provision of Solid Waste Collection services to Shoreline residents and businesses;
2. Equalize the level of service to similar customers across Shoreline; and
3. Ensure that the service is being provided at a competitive price.

Solid waste collection in the City is under the City's jurisdiction, but currently the terms under which the franchisees operate are the same as the WUTC's regulations. There is little opportunity to require different or new services like assistance with community cleanup events.

Key service level differences for residential customers include:

- Rates - Waste Management's rate is about 19% higher[1] than Rabanco's
- Recycling - Waste Management customers must separate recyclables into three bins that are carried out weekly, Rabanco customers utilize a wheeled toter, collected every other week, for all recyclables except glass
- Yard Waste - Waste Management collects it weekly and Rabanco collects it every other week[2].

Initial analysis indicates that Rabanco's current rates compare favorably with that charged in neighboring jurisdictions. The proposal's intent is to utilize a competitive process to ensure that all customers in Shoreline receive a market price.

The recommended process has three phases, i.e. RFP Distribution and Information, Proposal Review, and Selection and Negotiations. The purpose of the first phase is clarifying issues related to the RFP and the phase concludes with the submission of proposals by June 23, 2000. The second phase focuses on the review of submitted proposals by staff with a presentation to your Council, including a recommendation of a preferred provider, tentatively scheduled for July 17, 2000. The final phase will include detailed negotiations between the City and the preferred provider on specific contract language tentatively scheduled for consideration by your Council on August 28, 2000, so that the new contract can be in place by September 1, 2000 (the date current providers' authority to operate terminates). Because this is an ambitious timeline, staff is aware that a change in the schedule could be necessary to serve the City's interests. Staff will keep the Council appraised of any changes in the process that may be needed.

The RFP is structured such that each response must include a base proposal including a standard level of service including:

- Business and Residential solid waste collection: and
- Business and Residential recycling and yard waste processing and collection.

Each response must also include a number of alternate bid items for consideration by the City including:

- Mandatory collection:
- Vacation service suspension without resumption charges:
- Support for City recycling promotion programs:
- Support for community clean-up events: and
- Transition periods of differing lengths.

The intent of these alternate bid items is to assist the City in understanding the impact of these service decisions. It would be difficult to implement Mandatory collection, for example, without significant public participation in the decision making process. The

[1] Monthly rate for the typical one can service including recycling cost and credit.
[2] Both providers collect yard waste monthly December through February.

information provided by this alternate bid process, however, will assist the City in deciding if this significant service change is worth exploring in the future.

In addition to the required elements, each respondent is given the option to provide a proposal that differs from the base level of service with the effect of lowering proposal costs and increasing recycling or customer satisfaction.

All proposals will be evaluated based upon the following criteria:

1. Proposer's Background and Past Performance (20%)
2. Proposed Operations (25%)
3. Proposed customer implementation, outreach and relations (15%)
4. Total system price (40%)

The percentages are advisory only and each area is illustrated through a series of questions included in Chapter VI of the RFP.

The proposed RFP will have a proposed 7-year contract covering the services discussed in the RFP attached. This contract also includes an annual rate adjustment process based upon inflation and pass through cost increases such as taxes and/or King County fees. The final terms of the service contract will depend upon the proposals received and will be discussed with your Council in detail when this issue comes back for review of staff's recommendation regarding a preferred provider.

Staff has solicited letters of interest from providers in this region through both direct mailings and ads in the City's official publication and the Daily Journal of Commerce. The list of initial interested parties will be discussed with your Council during the staff presentation on this issue. With your Council's concurrence, the RFP will be revised based upon Council input and delivered to interested parties by May 18, 2000.

RECOMMENDATION

This item is for discussion purposes only. Staff does seek Council consensus supporting the recommended RFP process.

Approved By: City Manager LB City Attorney

BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

Solid waste in this region is divided into four main waste streams, i.e. Recyclable Materials, Yard Waste, Solid Waste, and Hazardous Waste. Hazardous Waste is defined by state and federal regulations and is not included in the proposed bundle of services to be contracted out. The City does offer some opportunities during the year to dispose of Hazardous Waste through existing grant programs. The definition of Recyclable Materials varies among jurisdictions, but at its core includes items such as newspaper, mixed paper, aluminum and tin cans, glass, and some types of plastic. The kind of materials that can be economically collected, processed, and sold has evolved over time and is expanding. The inclusion of a broader set of Recyclable Materials is a key feature of the proposed RFP process. Yard Waste includes grass clippings, leaves, and small twigs from tree and shrub trimming. These materials are processed through composting and marketed for soil amendment. The last category, Solid Waste, includes everything that is left and must be disposed of in a landfill or, in other regions, incinerated. Minimizing the amount of Solid Waste, through prevention or diversion to another waste stream, is a key focus of many state and county regulations and programs.[3]

The job of handling solid waste, from creation site to disposal or sale, can be divided in a number of ways depending on the participation of governmental agencies and/or the competitive market. All of the City's in King County outside of Seattle have executed an agreement with King County that directs their Solid Waste to the King County transfer and disposal system. This system consists of a number of regional transfer stations, including the 1st NE station in Shoreline, and a landfill located in southeast King County. The agreement requires participating cities to direct all solid waste to these transfer stations. King County Solid Waste, a division of King County Department of Natural Resources, collects a tipping fee based upon weight and then transports collected solid waste to its landfill for disposal.

As part of the King County transfer and disposal system, the City participates in a number of recycling related grant programs supported by tipping fees including the Local Hazardous Waste Management Plan (LHWMP) and City Optional Program (COP) grants. These grants are distributed to participating cities on a per capita basis. In addition, King County administers the state Waste Reduction and Recycling (WRR) grant program. The City participates in these programs utilizing a combination of contract, temporary, and regular staff.

The King County system does not include the infrastructure to transfer, process, and market Recyclable Materials or Yard Waste. As a result, in order to continue diverting these waste streams the City must contract not only for the collection of the three main waste streams, but also for the transfer, processing, and marketing of Recyclable Materials and Yard Waste. This is the same package of services that is currently being provided within the City by Rabanco and Waste Management under a City continuation franchise and WUTC regulation. Shoreline is comprised almost entirely of residential customers (95%). For this reason, most of the following analysis focuses on residential service.

State law at the time the City incorporated required a five-year continuation franchise after the termination of the WUTC authority over solid waste. Upon incorporation in August or 1995 and at the time of the City's annexation of Area B in February of 1997, the City granted existing solid waste collection company's continuation franchises to operate under existing WUTC regulation for a period of five years and provided notice of this action consistent with state law at that time. In July of 1997, new state law increased the franchise period to seven years and established specific notice requirements. As a result, continuation franchises provided by the City for annexation areas A-3, in November of 1998, and A-2, in August of 1999, are for seven years

[3] Seattle has taken steps to experiment with the identification of Food Waste as a fifth waste stream, but the safe and economic collection, processing, and sale of this stream is currently untested.

each. For this reason, while the proposed contract is expected to be awarded for the entire City, responsibility and authority to service these annexation areas will be added over time and will not be complete until August of 2006. It is possible that Rabanco, the current service provider for all these annexation areas, may voluntarily relinquish its rights to service these areas under certain conditions[4]. Figure 1, included in the attached RFP, identifies these annexation areas and the anticipated transition dates.

Terms (Can, Cart, or Toter?)

To avoid confusion, it is necessary to begin with a short discussion of how these terms are used and how they can be distinguished. A "can" refers to the standard garbage can that can be purchased at hardware store. It can usually hold about 32 gallons and does not have wheels. "Cart" and "toter" are synonyms and refer to 32 to 90 gallon containers with on set of wheels and usually a hinged lid for the 60 to 90 gallon sizes. We have attempted to use only the term toter in this report and subsequent documents. A 32 gallon toter has the same capacity as a "can" and is available from the hardware store. A 60 to 64 gallon toter is about equal to two "cans" as a 90 gallon toter is about equal to three "cans." It is unlikely that you will find a 60 to 90 gallon toter at a hardware store. Since collection service is priced by capacity, two "can" service is roughly equivalent to 60 gallon toter service, but the toter service is just a little more expensive in order to cover the cost of the container. Similarly, three "can" service is roughly equivalent to 90 gallon toter service. In addition, while a "can" is usually light enough for a collection worker to empty it without mechanical assistance, toters, 60 gallon and larger, are usually designed to be emptied by hydraulic equipment.

The term "container" is used generically for all the different kinds of solid waste receptacles, while "bin" refers specifically to rectangular receptacles usually without lid or wheels. Drop boxes are large mettle containers used most often for construction debris.

Current Service Levels

The service provided by current haulers, Rabanco and Waste Management, are fairly similar both to each other and to the proposed base level of services. The following discussion will identify the key differences between these two providers and issues that support the recommended base service levels.

Rates

Both current providers have a significant number of service options resulting in a complex pricing matrix. Fortunately, the vast majority of customers in Shoreline subscribe to a single level of service, i.e. one-can curbside residential collection. The following table describes the rates charged for the three most popular customer subscription options:

Service Level	**One Can (71%)[5]**	Two Cans (11%)	60-64 Gal. Toter (18%)
Waste Management	**$ 13.46**	$ 19.51	$ 20.51
Rabanco	**$ 11.29**	$ 15.18	$ 15.88
Percentage Difference	**19%**	29%	29%
Six City Average[6]	**$ 14.32**	$ 19.44	$ 20.06

[4] If it is selected as the service provider for the rest of the City, or the selected service provider purchases or trades for these rights, for example.

[5] Indicates percentage among three service levels included in the table based upon Waste Management's reported distribution of customers.

[6] From Table 1 of Analysis of City of Redmond Options to Extend Solid Waste Collection Contract, completed by Sound Resource Management in April of 1999. The six cities included were Bellevue, Bothell, Federal Way, Kirkland, Renton, and Woodinville.

The rates included in the above comparison contain charges for recycling, recycling credit for commodity values, and container rental (if any), but do not include taxes and other regulatory fees. A six-city average compiled in 1999 indicates that Waste Management's charges appear to be close to market rates while Rabanco's rates appear to be below market. This is hard to say for certain due to the possibility that differing service level requirements in other cities may impact rates.

Recyclable Materials – Collection Frequency
Both providers collect what used to be considered the standard package of recyclable materials, i.e. newspaper, mixed paper, aluminum and tin cans, glass, and number 2 plastic (milk containers). The service level difference is related to how these materials are collected. Waste Management utilizes source separation. Each customer must separate these materials into three bins that are collected at the curb weekly. This method is susceptible to customer error in the sorting process and the materials can get wet or be spread by wind when set out for collection.

Rabanco, in contrast, utilizes a commingled collection process that allows customers to place all recyclables accept glass into one covered container. Their recycling processing center separates the materials resulting in a more consistent, higher quality, and, as a result, higher value recycled products. Rabanco utilizes a 90 gallon wheeled toter, with an insert (bin) for glass, that is collected every other week. Collection of recyclables is alternated with collection of yard waste, i.e. one week solid waste and recycling are collected and the next solid waste and yard waste are collected. This limits the impact on traffic in any given neighborhood to two trucks used one day per week. Every week collection of all materials, utilized by Waste Management, requires the use of three trucks either all on one day or spread over two days. Seattle established this commingled alternating collection schedule service as its base service level in its recent RFP process. Waste Management was awarded the north Seattle service contract and now provides this kind of service south of 145th Ave. NE.

On the down side, some Shoreline customers have expressed concern that the 90 Gal. toter currently utilized by Rabanco in Shoreline for recyclables is too big and heavy for them to move. Some have also commented that they don't need a container that large for recyclables. Rabanco provides the same toter to all residential customers regardless of level of service.

Proposed Base Service Levels (Chapter II of RFP)
The proposed base level of service is drawn from three sources; current service levels, the base service level demanded by Seattle in its recent RFP process, and stakeholder input. Service is broken into six major categories consisting of the two customer types (commercial and residential) and three included waste streams (solid waste, recyclable materials, and yard waste). Proposed changes to these services relate predominantly to recycling services and collection frequency discussed in the next sections.

The base level of service also provides for a change in service delivery philosophy. Currently there is a hard line between commercial and residential customers, i.e. commercial customers get commercial service and vice-versa. The change is a focus on service need rather than customer type. A small business could, for example, be well served by residential one can service. A multi-family development, as a second example, designed to mimic single family residences could also be well served by individual residential one can service instead of centralized commercial service. In this way, the container type or service level describes the customer type rather than the other way around. The question becomes simply "what is the best level of service for this customer."

Drop Box and Bulky Item/White Goods are two additional on-call services that are included as base services. To utilize Drop Box service, a customer contacts the hauler who delivers a container of requested size. The customer then calls when the container is full and the hauler dumps it. The customer usually pays a delivery and rental for the container and a dump fee based upon the weight of the solid waste dumped. This is a standard service currently provided.

The Bulky Item/White Goods service would be a new service allowing predominantly residential customers to leave a couch or old refrigerator on the curb and call the hauler for disposal. This service is popular in Seattle and provides an alternative to self-hauling or letting this kind of debris accumulate in the yard.

Recyclable Materials – Collection Frequency
The proposed base level of service expands the definition of Recyclable Materials to also include ferrous metal, poly-coated paper (milk cartons), aseptic packaging, and number 1 through 7 plastic containers. This expansion is supported by both market and processing changes and customer service demands and is consistent with Seattle's new service level.

Pilot collection projects for these materials have resulted in new processing technologies and a growing market. At the same time, customers have contacted the City seeking opportunities to recycle these products. Bi-annual recycling events held by the City include the collection of many of these materials, but it is hard for customers to save products for up to six months waiting for an opportunity to participate in these events. In addition, many customers don't distinguish among the differing kind of plastics and are likely to already be including other than #2 plastics in recycling bins. This expansion is also consistent with state and county policies focused on diverting materials from the solid waste stream headed for land fill.

Commingled collection of recyclables is also included in the base level of service. This method of collection has improved recycling efforts resulting in a greater diversion of these materials from the solid waste stream. Two factors have been identified as contributing to this method's success. First, not having to sort is easier for customers. Second, the lidded container and the sorting by the hauler results in a lower quantity of contaminated product (wet paper for example). Customer concerns regarding the size of the container are addressed in the proposed RFP by requiring the provider to utilize recycling containers of differing sizes in order to match size more appropriately to level of service. In addition, carry out service is included at no cost for disabled customers or for a fee to those who simply desire this increased level of service.

Similar to Rabanco's current practice, the proposed RFP establishes weekly solid waste collection and alternating recycling and yard waste collection. After an initial adjustment period, customers served by Rabanco have little difficulty with this alternating schedule. The primary benefit of this methodology, which has been adopted by Seattle, is that it results in fewer truck trips reducing costs and traffic impacts. In some service areas this methodology may reduce truck trips from three to one utilizing vehicles that can collect both solid waste and recyclables or yard waste. This can only work if both materials are unloaded at the same transfer facility. The City's agreement with King County (to utilize the transfer station for solid waste) makes this impossible. The change should still reduce transportation costs and impact on neighborhoods.

Seattle divided its City into three territories for their bidding process and awarded Rabanco the central and south service areas and Waste Management the north service area. As a result, both of these providers are currently providing service inside Seattle that is almost identical to the base level of service described in the proposed RFP.

Recyclable Material and Yard Waste Credit
Both providers currently provide a commodities credit for the "market value" of recyclable materials collected. The intent of this practice is to partially offset the cost of recycling collection through profit sharing with the collection company. There are, however, three problems with the implementation of this practice. First, commodity prices fluctuate, sometimes significantly, leading to rate instability and customer complaints. Second, the collection rate covers all of the service provider's costs of collection and processing and sales revenue is distributed back to customers, so the service provider has no incentive to increase sales revenue. Third, it is difficult, some would say impossible, to ensure that the credit offered by the service provider accurately reflects the value of the commodities collected. As a result, the County, Seattle, and other entities with significant staffs administering these relationships are attempting to address these problems with contract language and staff time, and are expanding the idea to yard waste. Seattle has, for example, include the right to monitor the contractor's operations and to perform sampling. It also references regional market value indices to establish commodity values. Utilizing these options takes significant resources and still does not eliminate the potential for commodity under valuation or provide the contractor incentives to reduce costs or increase the market value of these commodities.

In contrast, smaller contracting agencies are moving away from the credit concept. The theory is that, in a competitive bid process, prospective service providers will include estimated commodity values in calculating their bid price for service. This gives customers the value of a credit without market risk or enforcement issues. In addition, service prices are more stable without annual adjustments caused by changing commodity values. This method also provides the prevailing service provider with a profit motive to reduce collection and processing costs while maximizing the value of the commodities improving the marketplace for recyclable materials and yard waste products over time. This is the methodology included in the proposed RFP process.

Standards
The base service also enacts a series of standards that are either lacking or go unenforced under the current regulatory framework. Specific standards for the timing of container delivery, vehicle maintenance, clean up of spills, and more are established and liquidated damages for violations delineated. This level of detail is not included in the RFP itself, but is included in the proposed service contract that will be attached to the RFP when it is distributed. Enforcing these standards will be an important new opportunity and responsibility for the City.

Optional Proposals (Chapter III of RFP)
The RFP requests respondents to include pricing and contract information for a number of service alternatives. It also invites respondents to propose any change in the requested services that they believe will result in better service at a lower price. While the intent of requesting responses to specific service alternatives is to gain information, the intent of the open invitation is to ensure that the City is not turning a blind eye to potential opportunities. Your Council will ultimately be able to decide which of these alternatives to include in the final contract after customer costs and services are fully analyzed following the RFP process.

Service Alternatives
Service alternatives listed in the RFP include:

- Vacation service cancellation for periods greater than 2 weeks in duration without resumption charges;
- Support for three community cleanup events (east, central, and west) per year with a maximum annual tipping fee expenditure of $2,000 adjusted annually for inflation;
- Support for City programs designed to encourage recycling and waste diversion through a $50,000 annual payment,
- Mandatory collection for all residential customers;
- Three month transition period from effective date of contract to full implementation of required services; and
- Six month transition period from effective date of contract to full implementation of required services.

For analytical purposes, we divide the service alternatives included in the RFP into two categories; those that, as long as the price impact is acceptable, are likely to be recommended, and those that are designed to provide information for future research and policy development. The first three bullets above are designed to fit into the first category. Each is consistent with existing policies and customer requests for services, they are listed separately simply to ensure that they do not, for some unknown reason, have a rate impact that is disproportionate to their benefit.

In contrast, mandatory collection, due to its far reaching impact and significant change from current operations, is unlikely to be recommended at this time even if its rate benefit is significant. However, if it does happen to represent the potential for a significant rate benefit, then the City can place greater emphasis on seeking community consensus regarding the potential implementation of mandatory service. The draft contract language does provide an opportunity to implement this change during its course.

The last two options are designed to assist the City in implementing the service transition in an economical manner. The draft contract transfers responsibility upon execution providing little time for an orderly transition. These alternatives should guide the City in determining how long of a transition period is appropriate.

Selection Process (Chapter IV of RFP)
The proposed selection process is modeled after that recently utilized by the City of Seattle. It includes the utilization of a committee composed of staff selected by the City Manager to review and analyze proposals in accordance with the objectives and criteria discussed below.

Proposed Schedule
The proposed schedule is shorter than typically used for this kind of process. There is only four and a half months from the transmittal of the RFP to the proposed effective date. Selection of one of the two proposed transition alternatives discussed above may ease the impact of this short schedule. Alternatively, it may be necessary to revise the proposed schedule to provide additional time for responses, community input, contract negotiations, staff review, and/or Council consideration. The option to revise the schedule and make other changes to the RFP process after it is released is specifically reserved.

The propose schedule has the follow key dates (a more detailed schedule is included in the proposed RFP attached):

Phase 1 - RFP Distribution and Information	
Request for Proposals Mailed	May 18, 2000
PROPOSALS DUE	**2:00pm, June 23, 2000**
Phase 2 - Proposal Review	
Presentation of Proposals to City Council	July 17, 2000
Phase 3 - Selection and negotiations	
Notification of recommended contractor	July 18, 2000
Presentation of recommended contract to City Council	August 28, 2000
CONTRACT EFFECTIVE	**September 1, 2000**

Solid Waste Priorities And Proposal Selection

The proposed process provides two frameworks to assist staff in recommending a preferred contractor for Council consideration. The first is a set of nine overall objectives that attempt to embody both the purpose for seeking the proposed service delivery change and the key characteristics of the desired service delivery system including:

1. Minimum cost
2. High quality of service
3. Equitable levels of service for all customers (including uniform collection frequencies and materials accepted and an increase in recycling participation)
4. New services desired by customers
5. Minimum customer confusion and service disruption during implementation
6. Opportunities for service evolution (such as new recyclable materials, mandatory collection, extension of service into annexation areas)
7. Services based on container type instead of dwelling or customer type
8. Opportunities for contractor innovation
9. Reduced environmental impacts (such as, number of trucks, spills, noise, etc.)

Evaluation Criteria

Specific evaluation criteria are proposed to guide staff's analysis of how each proposal serves the objectives discussed above. In addition, individual criteria are weighted in order to communicate both to those responding to the RFP and the staff reviewing those responses the relative importance that will be given to each area of interest as follows:

- Proposer's background and past performance (20%)
- Proposed operations (25%)
- Proposed customer implementation, outreach and relations (15%)
- Total system price (40%)

More detail regarding the factors that will be considered as part of the analysis for each criterion is provided in the Section F of Chapter IV of the proposed RFP attached. The percentages are provided only as guidance to staff and respondents to clarify the relative priorities of the City. Staff does not intend to use a specific weighted ranking process to compare Proposals and the RFP specifically reserves the City's ability to choose the respondent it believes best suited to provide the requested services regardless of the outcome of the criteria analysis.

Evaluation Committee's Recommendation

After reviewing all proposals and clarifying issues as necessary, staff will present a recommended proposal to your Council for consideration. This proposal will include detailed information regarding the services to be provided and the cost of those services. It may not, however, contain final contract language. If your Council concurs with staff's recommendation at this point, final contract language will be negotiated and brought back to your Council for consideration.

Implementation

The City does not currently have a Recycling Coordinator position or other staff charged with the responsibility of monitoring solid waste collection services. Monitoring and ensuring appropriate enforcement and development of service responsibilities is estimated to require a half time position at a minimum. Current grant funding for recycling and waste reduction programs is not sufficient to support this position unaided. The service alternative providing for $50,000 annually is designed to address this shortfall. Staff is still in the process of developing a job description and salary recommendation for this position and will present that description and a recommended funding alternative to your Council for consideration in the future along with a request to authorize this new position.

SUMMARY

The desired outcome of this process is to consolidate solid waste service under one provider and ensure that an adequate and consistent level of solid waste collection services is provided throughout the City. The City's resource constraints and lack of experience with this service area, however, suggest that only minor adjustments in existing services, consistent with customer requests, be made at this time. The proposed RFP is designed to serve this purpose within these constraints. The timeline propose, however, is ambitious. Staff will keep your Council apprised of the progress of this process and whether change in schedule becomes necessary to serve the City's interests.

RECOMMENDATION

This item is for discussion purposes only. Staff does seek Council consensus supporting the recommended RFP process.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Proposed Solid Waste Collection Services Request For Proposals

Attachment A

Proposed Solid Waste Collection Services
Request For Proposals

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SOLID WASTE COLLECTION SERVICES

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

May 18, 2000

SHORELINE SOLID WASTE COLLECTION SERVICES

Summary Of Request For Proposals

Service Description
The City of Shoreline (the City) is requesting Proposals for the collection of commercial and residential garbage and the collection and processing of recyclables and yard waste. Qualifying Proposals must include collection services for all waste streams. Yard waste and recyclables processing proposals must also be submitted with any collection proposal.

This Request for Proposals (RFP) designates four geographic areas. Proposers are required to submit proposals for collection of all waste streams from all areas. The authority and obligation to operate in the identified annexation areas will not begin until existing service rights have been terminated in accordance with state law (see Figure 1). The City anticipates awarding a single 7-year contract for service of all areas. (Exhibit A)

Schedule
All Proposers must submit a Letter of Intent by June 9, 2000. The format for the Letter of Intent is attached as Exhibit B. Proposals are due by **2:00 p.m., June 23, 2000.** The City plans to select contractors by July 2000 and sign contracts by August 2000. Contracted services will begin September 1, 2000 and extend through August 31, 2007. The City will retain an option to extend the contracts for two additional one year terms to August 31, 2008 and to August 31,2009.

City Contact
All inquiries about this RFP must be made in written form (including mail, email or fax) to the Project Manager:

The City of Shoreline
Attention: Kristoff T. Bauer
17544 Midvale Ave. N.
Shoreline, WA 98155

Telephone: 206-546-1297
Fax: 206-546-2200
Email: kbauer@ci.shoreline.wa.us

Unless authorized by the Project Manager, no other City official or employee is empowered to speak for the City with respect to this RFP. Proposers who contact other City officials or employees in regard to this RFP may be disqualified.

The City reserves the right to reject any and all Proposals and to decline to award a contract for these services. The City will bear no responsibility for costs incurred in preparation of responses to this RFP.

Contents

SUMMARY OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS i

CHAPTER I - OVERVIEW I-1

A. PRIORITIES I-1
B. RFP AND PROPOSAL APPROACH I-1
C. BASE PROPOSALS I-2
D. ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS I-2
E. BACKGROUND ON SHORELINE'S CUSTOMERS I-3

CHAPTER II - BASE SERVICES II-1

A. COLLECTION AREAS II-1
B. PROCESSING II-1
C. COLLECTION SERVICES II-1
D. GENERAL COLLECTION REQUIREMENTS II-2
E. GARBAGE COLLECTION II-2
F. YARD WASTE COLLECTION II-3
G. RECYCLING COLLECTION II-3
H. ADDITIONAL CONTRACT SPECIFICATIONS II-4
I. CONTRACTOR RATES II-4
J. AMENDMENTS OR SUPPLEMENTS II-5

CHAPTER III - ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS III-1

A. MANDATORY ALTERNATE BID ITEMS III-1
B. ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION SERVICES III-2

CHAPTER IV - SELECTION PROCESS IV-1

A. PROPOSED SCHEDULE IV-1
B. RFP DISTRIBUTION AND INFORMATION IV-1
C. INITIAL PROPOSAL REVIEW IV-2
D. CONTRACTOR EVALUATION COMMITTEE IV-2
E. SOLID WASTE PRIORITIES AND PROPOSAL SELECTION IV-2
F. EVALUATION CRITERIA IV-3
G. INTERVIEWS AND PRESENTATIONS IV-4
H. CITY INVESTIGATION AND INSPECTIONS IV-4
I. EVALUATION COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION IV-4
J. PUBLIC DOCUMENTS AND DISCLOSURE IV-5
K. RESERVATIONS AND LIMITATIONS IV-5

CHAPTER V - PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS V-1

A. INITIAL COMMUNICATIONS V-1
B. SUBMITTING PROPOSALS V-2

CHAPTER VI - PROPOSAL QUESTIONS VI-1

A. BACKGROUND AND PAST PERFORMANCE VI-1
B. OPERATIONS VI-3
C. CUSTOMER IMPLEMENTATION, OUTREACH AND RELATIONS VI-7
D. PRICE PROPOSALS VI-9

CHAPTER VII - PROPOSAL FORMS VII-1

A. CERTIFICATION FORMS VII-1
B. BACKGROUND FORMS VII-6
C. OPERATIONS FORMS VII-9
D. PRICE FORM VII-13

EXHIBIT A - SOLID WASTE COLLECTION AND PROCESSING CONTRACT

EXHIBIT B - LETTER INTENT

EXHIBIT C - SAMPLE RATE ADJUSTMENTS

Chapter I - Overview

A. Priorities

This RFP and the ensuing contractor selection process have been designed to produce new solid waste contracts (beginning in September 2000).

The City presently has two separate solid waste collection providers operating under franchises granted by the City. The franchises for most of the territory in the City expire on August 31, 2000. Transfer and disposal services are provided by King County Solid Waste Division via a transfer station located within the City and are not part of this RFP process. Services to be contracted include garbage can collection, garbage detachable container collection, yard waste collection and processing, curb recycling collection and processing, centralized apartment recycling and processing, and commercial garbage and recycling collection. These services are described in **Chapter II - Base Services.**

RFP Principles

The City developed the following principles to create this RFP and to guide the contractor selection process. The City seeks:

1. Minimum cost
2. High quality of service
3. Equitable levels of service for all customers (including uniform collection frequencies and materials accepted and an increase in recycling participation)
4. New services desired by customers
5. Minimum customer confusion and service disruption during implementation
6. Opportunities for service evolution (such as new recyclable materials, mandatory collection, extension of service into annexation areas)
7. Services based on container type instead of dwelling or customer type
8. Opportunities for contractor innovation
9. Reduced environmental impacts (number of trucks, facility odors, etc.)

B. RFP and Proposal Approach

This RFP is based on a two-prong approach, inviting both *comparable* and *innovative* Proposals to fulfill the City's RFP Principles:

1. **Base Proposal -** All Proposers must submit a Base Proposal that covers a prescribed Base Service as described in **Section C** and in greater detail in **Chapter II - Base Services** and **Exhibit A - Solid Waste Collection and Processing Contract.** This Base Service was developed by the City as a "rational" system that would meet the RFP principles, including efficiency, cost, and customer service.

2. **Alternative Proposals -** The City also welcomes Alternative Proposals with variations from the Base Services that would provide lower system costs,

increased efficiency, reduced impacts, better customer service and/or other benefits to the City and residents.

Under this design, Proposals will have both required and optional components:

- All Proposers *must* submit a Base Proposal covering **the collection** of *all waste streams* and **processing** of yard waste and recyclables in the manner described below under Base Services.

- Proposers must also submit mandatory **Alternate** proposals as identified.

- Proposers have the *option* of submitting additional **Alternative** Proposals. The City welcomes alternatives to the Base Services, from minor revisions in contract language to major collection system changes.

C. Base Proposals

Chapter II - Base Services describes a universal Base Service to which all Proposers must respond, including:

- **Contract Collection** - Proposers are required to submit Proposals for the entire service area including annexation areas upon the expiration of City continuation franchises.

- **Same Day Residential Collection** - Contractors will collect all materials within each residential collection route on the same day each week with an alternating collection schedule - garbage collection and recyclables collection one week, and garbage collection and yard waste collection the next week.

- **Commingled Recycling Collection** - Paper, plastic, tin, and aluminum will be collected from a commingled container with glass collected from a separate container.

- **Recycling, and Yard Waste Processing and Marketing** - The City also requires proposals for processing of recycling and yard waste. Proposers must submit integrated prices for processing *with* collection.

A full description of these Base Services is contained in **Chapter II - Base Services** and in **Exhibit A - Solid Waste Collection and Processing Contract**.

D. Alternative Proposals

Chapter III - Alternative Proposals describes a number of alternates that must be responded to separately and the framework for developing and proposing optional alternatives to the Base Services including changes to the contract specifications, the proposed system operations, or other conditions. Alternatives should be based on superior benefits to the City and residents over the described Base Services.

E. Background on Shoreline's Customers

The City of Shoreline has a population of approximately 55,000 or 26,000 households. Garbage collection services are provided to approximately 12,700 residential accounts, 650 commercial accounts, and less than 100 roll off accounts. This information refers to the entire City including those annexation areas that will not become part of the contract immediately upon execution (see Figure 1). King County's 1st NE transfer station is centrally located in the City.

Figure 1 – Solid Waste Collection Areas

Chapter II - Base Services

This Chapter describes specific *Base Service* conditions for collecting garbage, recycling, and yard waste. These conditions represent a uniform service to which all Proposers *must respond* in their Base Proposal. The RFP also welcomes additional Proposals that lay out alternatives to the Base Service conditions (see **Chapter III - Alternative Proposals**).

The Base Services are described below. **Exhibit A - Solid Waste Collection and Processing Contract** contains definitions for all terms and the details of service provision.

A. Collection Areas

The City is not divided into separate collection areas for response purposes. A single contract is expected to be awarded for the entire City, but the implementation date of contract collection service will depend upon when the area was annexed to the City (see Figure 1) as follows:

- Original Incorporated Area, September 1, 2000;
- Annexation Area A-1, February 26, 2002
- Annexation Area A-3, November 27, 2005
- Annexation Area A-2, August 1, 2006

B. Processing

Collection Proposals must include processing for recyclables and yard waste collected. Solid waste will be directed to the King County transfer facility located within the City.

C. Collection Services

Collection Proposals will cover *all* solid waste collection services in each collection area. The City designates seven types of collection services:

- **Garbage Can** service can be requested by any account, regardless of structure type or size.

- **Garbage Detachable Container** service can be requested by any account, regardless of structure type or size.

- **Recycling** the new contractors will provide recycling containers to *all can premises*, except accounts currently receiving centralized apartment or commercial recycling. In addition, contractors are encouraged to identify residential structures currently with centralized apartment recycling that would be better served by curbside service.

- **Centralized Apartment and Commercial Recycling** the new contractors will be required to provide recycling for all accounts other than Drop-Box service customers.

- **Yard Waste** service can be requested by any account regardless of structure or account type.

- **Drop-Box** service can be requested by any account regardless of structure or account type.

- **Bulky Items and White Goods** - Contractors will provide separate, on demand, collection of bulky items and white goods, and will be compensated on a price per item basis for this service.

D. General Collection Requirements

The following general conditions apply to collection services under the Base Proposal:

1. **All Waste Streams** - Contractors will be responsible for collection of all residential and commercial garbage, yard waste, and recyclables within the service area.

2. **Same Day Collection** - Contractors will collect all residential materials within each collection route on the same day each week with an alternating collection schedule - garbage collection and recyclables collection one week, and garbage collection and yard waste collection the next week. Contractors are encouraged to continue the current day of the week for garbage collection wherever possible.

3. **Container Location** - Contractors will collect garbage cans and recycling primarily from curbside locations. Residents may choose the option of subscribing to carry-out collection for an additional fee. In addition, carry-out garbage, yard waste and recycling collection will continue to be provided to residents who are physically unable to place materials at the curb for no additional charge.

4. **Manner of Collection** - Contractors will provide all services according the specifications described in **Exhibit A - Solid Waste Collection and Processing Contract.**

E. Garbage Collection

The following conditions apply to garbage collection under the Base Proposal:

1. **Weekly Collection** - Contractors will provide weekly collection of garbage from all can customers and collect from detachable containers as frequently as requested by the customer, but no less than once a week.

2. **Transfer Location**- Contractors will be required to tip garbage collected at King County's 1st NE transfer station located within the City.

3. **Containers** - Contractors will provide initial and replacement cans and detachable containers for garbage and recycling collection that match each customer's subscribed service level. New contractors are encouraged to continue using current containers and should work with current contractors to limit customer confusion regarding containers during initial implementation. Contractors will provide replacements for containers that are damaged, lost or stolen or when the customer requests a change in service level. No rental fee will be charged for containers.

4. **Service Level** - Contractors will monitor garbage service levels including excess materials. Garbage can customers pay for a subscribed service level, including micro can (12 gallons), mini can (20 gallons), and 32, 60 and 90 gallon service.

5. **Extra Garbage** - Customers choose a specific size container for garbage collection, and retain the option of setting out additional containers for an additional charge. Contractors will record excess materials and include these collections in summary data provided to the City upon request.

F. Yard Waste Collection

The following conditions apply to yard waste collection under the Base Proposal:

1. **Bi-Weekly Collection** - Contractors will provide bi-weekly collection of yard waste March through October and monthly collection November through February.

2. **Transfer Location** - Contractor will provide resources necessary for the transfer and processing of yard waste.

3. **Containers** - Customers will supply containers, bags or bundles for yard waste collection, and residents will not be allowed to place yard waste in plastic bags.

4. **Service Level** - Contractor will collect yard waste only from residents or businesses paying for this optional service.

5. **Extra Yard Waste** - Customers will subscribe to a specific level of yard waste collection, and will retain the option of setting out additional containers for additional charges. Contractor will record excess materials and include these collections in summary data provided to the City upon request.

G. Recycling Collection

The following conditions apply to recycling collection under the Base Proposal:

1. **Bi-Weekly Collection** - In the Base Proposal, Contractors will provide bi-weekly collection of recyclable material from all residential customers. More or less frequent centralized apartment or commercial collection may be required from the participating commercial accounts.

2. **Transfer Location** - Contractor will provide resources necessary for the transfer, processing, and marketing of collected recyclable materials.

3. **Containers** - Contractors will provide 60 or 90-gallon wheeled containers (Mobile Toters) and an insert container for glass to all accounts that receive garbage can service. New contractors are encouraged to continue using current containers where consistent with this requirement and should work with current contractors to limit customer confusion regarding containers during initial implementation.

4. **Centralized Apartment Containers** - Initial and replacement containers for centralized apartment recycling service will be supplied and delivered by the Contractor. Contractor will continue using the current containers where consistent. Contractor will supply detachable containers (2-4 cubic yard) for commingled materials (except glass) and three smaller containers (Mobile Toters) for sorted glass.

5. **Recyclable Materials** - Contractors will collect recycling from two waste streams:
   - Customers will set-out mixed glass in an insert container.
   - Customers will set-out all other materials in a commingled Toter, including mixed waste paper (including corrugated), newspaper, tin and aluminum cans, Ferrous metal, poly-coated paper, aseptic packaging, and number 1 through 7 plastic containers.

6. **Service Levels** - The Contractor will have the responsibility to provide the type of recycling collection service that best meets the needs of an account.

7. **Business Recycling** - Contractors will provide for the collection of recyclable material from businesses in accordance with the needs of each business.

H. Additional Contract Specifications

Detailed specifications for contract collection, processing, reporting, compensation, discrimination, liability, and other provisions are listed in **Exhibit A - Solid Waste Collection and Processing Contract.** All Proposers are responsible for understanding and agreeing to the contract specifications. In the event of a conflict between the Contract and any other RFP documents, the Contract controls.

I. Contractor Rates

The following specifications describe the methods for establishing contractor rates under the Base Proposal:

1. **Service Rates** - Rate for garbage, yard waste, and recycling collection will be based on the rates negotiated by the parties for the first contract year (September 2000 - August 2001).

   For later contract years (beginning August 2001), payments will be adjusted to reflect changes in the Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton CPI and changes in applicable tipping

fees. Specific adjustment terms are provided in **Exhibit A - Solid Waste Collection and Processing Contract** and demonstrated in **Exhibit C - Sample Rate Adjustments.**

2. **Value of Recyclable Materials and Processed Yard Waste –** Contractors are expected to propose a rate for the collection of Recyclable Materials and Yard Waste that reflects the value of these commodities. No mechanism to provide Customers a credit based upon revenue derived from the sale of these materials will be provided. The Contractor will bear the risk of fluctuation in commodity values.

J. Amendments or Supplements

The City may amend or supplement this RFP. The City will provide information regarding any changes to this RFP to those firms that have submitted a Letter of Intent.

Chapter III - Alternative Proposals

The City welcomes Alternative Proposals for collection and processing which result in a more efficient system, reduced environmental impacts, better customer service, and/or lower overall system costs.

The City has chosen three-prong approach for this RFP:

1. Requiring that all Proposals cover a prescribed Base Service level (described in **Chapter II - Base Services**) and

2. Requiring that all Proposals cover a few alternate bid items (described in this chapter).

3. Inviting Alternative Proposals to the Base Service level that would provide superior benefits to the City and residents (described in this chapter).

Specific Mandatory Alternate bid items are listed below. Permitted Alternative Proposals can range from minor revisions to collection service to major changes in the requested level of service or contract terms. Specific examples of Permitted Alternatives are provided below for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to be all-inclusive or preferred.

A. Mandatory Alternate Bid Items

All proposals will include discussion of the impact on rates and service, and specific contract language changes if necessary, that would result from the addition of the following services or service constraints:

- Mandatory collection for all residential customers;
- Vacation service cancellation for periods greater than 2 weeks in duration without resumption charges;
- Support for three community cleanup events (east, central, and west) per year with a maximum annual tipping fee expenditure of $2,000 adjusted annually for inflation;
- Support for City programs designed to encourage recycling and waste diversion through a $50,000 annual payment,
- Three month transition period from effective date of contract to full implementation of required services; and
- Six month transition period from effective date of contract to full implementation of required services.

The City retains the discretion to include any combination of the above alternative bid items or none of them within the base services required under the awarded contract.

B. Alternative Collection Services

The City encourages proposed changes to the Base Services or contract specifications which would lower Proposal costs, increase recycling or increase customer satisfaction, such as:

- Variations in collection frequencies or methods of collection;
- A different mix of recyclables than identified in the Base Service level;
- Changing the manner of collection service or collection performance requirements to reduce overall price;
- Different collection boundaries; or
- Providing more services to customers without significantly increasing costs.

All alternative proposals must identify specific contract revisions proposed and a clear and complete discussion of the benefits and other impacts of the proposal on the base level of services discussed herein.

Prohibited alternatives

There are a few specific provisions that must be followed for acceptable Alternative Proposals:

1. Yard waste and recyclables that are separated by the customer can not be collected or mixed with garbage.

2. Collected garbage can not be diverted from King County's transfer and disposal system.

3. The Insurance and Default/Performance Bond requirements cannot be waived.

Evaluation of Alternatives

The City is looking for Alternative Proposals that offer reduced overall system costs, superior system efficiency, improved customer service, and/or reduced environmental impacts. Instructions for submitting Alternative Proposals are provided in **Chapter V - Proposal Instructions**. Proposals will be evaluated specifically under the RFP principles in **Chapter I - Overview** and the Evaluation Criteria in **Chapter IV - Selection Process**. If the City concludes that an Alternative Proposal offers superior benefits, then the City could require all finalists to propose a price for that alternative through a Clarification Request.

Chapter IV - Selection Process

The City has developed a review process built on specific review phases and flexibility within the phases for selecting final and winning Proposals. The City has established specific criteria to guide the evaluation but does not anticipate using a weighted ranking system. The selection and contract execution process is expected to take two months after Proposals are submitted. Implementation of new services will begin September 1, 2000.

A. Proposed Schedule

The following Proposed schedule for receipt and review of Proposals has been established. The schedule may be changed at the City's discretion. Any Proposal may be rejected during any of the phases listed below.

ACTION	PROPOSED DATE
Phase 1 - RFP Distribution and Information	
Advertise Request for Proposals	May 1 & 3, 2000
Letters of Interest due	May 12, 2000
Request for Proposals Mailed	May 18, 2000
Questions for Proposers' Conference due	May 31, 2000
Proposers' Conference	June 6, 2000
Letters of Intent Due	June 9, 2000
Last day for Proposers' questions	June 14, 2000
PROPOSALS DUE	**2:00pm, June 23, 2000**
Phase 2 - Proposal Review	
Clarification requests by the City	June 30, 2000
Clarification responses by Proposers due	July 10, 2000
Presentation of Proposals to City Council	July 17, 2000
Phase 3 - Selection and Negotiations	
Notification of recommended contractor	July 18, 2000
Presentation of recommended contract to City Council	August 28, 2000
Contract Effective	**September 1, 2000**

B. RFP Distribution and Information

1. **Proposers' Conference and Inquiries** - All Proposers are invited to meet with City representatives to ask questions at a conference to be held on June 6, 2000, from 1:30 p.m. - 5 p.m. at Shoreline City Hall third floor conference room. The City will accept written questions for the conference (by mail or email) on or before May 31, 2000. This will allow the City time to obtain the information requested prior to the

conference and, if practical, supply a written response at the conference. When possible, City staff will answer additional questions at the conference.

City staff, including the Project Manager, will attend. Questions posed at the conference will be recorded. The questions and answers will be provided to all Proposers.

2. **Letters of Intent** - All proposers must submit a Letter of Intent to the Project Manager by June 9, 2000 in order to be considered in subsequent phases of the selection process. (A sample Letter of Intent is attached as Exhibit B and included upon the disk provided with the RFP.)

C. Initial Proposal Review

All Proposals will be reviewed for clarity and completeness. Proposals must include:

- responses to all questions in Chapter VI and
- all completed forms from Chapter VII.

Proposals determined to be complete and responsive will be considered. The City may request clarifying information and/or may choose to remove Proposals from further consideration without seeking additional information. The City may also require initial presentations. *The City reserves the right to reject any and all Proposals.*

D. Contractor Evaluation Committee

Proposals will be evaluated by a Contractor Evaluation Committee (CEC) composed of individuals with legal, financial, and solid waste management backgrounds appointed by the City Manager. The committee may include outside consultants.

E. Solid Waste Priorities and Proposal Selection

Each Proposal will be evaluated on its responsiveness to improve the quality, efficiency and impacts of all solid waste services. Furthermore, the City has identified specific principles, as listed in **Chapter I Background,** to guide the CEC in selecting Proposals that are responsive and innovative in their support of the City's values. Specifically, the City desires collection services that will provide:

1. Minimum cost
2. High quality of service
3. Equitable levels of service for all customers (including uniform collection frequencies and materials accepted and an increase in recycling participation)
4. New services desired by customers
5. Minimum customer confusion and service disruption during implementation
6. Opportunities for service evolution (such as new recyclable materials, mandatory collection, extension of service into annexation areas)
7. Services based on container type instead of dwelling or customer type
8. Opportunities for contractor innovation
9. Reduced environmental impacts (such as, number of trucks and facility odors)

These values and principles help frame the overall priorities for the Proposal evaluation and contract selection process.

F. Evaluation Criteria

The following criteria - and the supporting **Chapter VI - Proposal Questions** - were developed to provide specific guidance to the Contract Evaluation Committee (CEC) in understanding program priorities and selecting Proposals that will best serve the goals and needs of the City.

The evaluation criteria are divided into four categories with relative priorities allocated to each category:

- Proposer's background and past performance (20%)
- Proposed operations (25%)
- Proposed customer implementation, outreach and relations (15%)
- Total system price (40%)

The percentages are provided *only as guidance* to CEC members to clarify the relative priorities of the City. The City does not expect to use a weighted ranking to compare Proposals.

1. **Proposer's Background and Past Performance (20%) -** The City seeks contractors with secure and reliable financial standing, limited past litigation problems, extensive and successful service delivery, state of art equipment and communications, high customer and client satisfaction and a strong record of environmental and other legal compliance.

Specifically, Proposers will be evaluated on:

- Litigation history,
- Financial strength,
- Successful experience in other jurisdictions,
- Customer complaint and resolution,
- References from jurisdictions in which the Proposer operates,
- Public Records involving Proposer,
- Environmental performance, and
- Clarity and responsiveness of the Proposal.

2. **Proposed Operations (25%) -** As stated in the solid waste values and principles listed above, the City seeks innovative and responsive Proposals that improve system efficiency, keep costs down, allow improved access to services, meet customer needs, increase recycling diversion, reduce impacts on public and environmental health, and provide long-term service stability.

Specifically, Proposers will be evaluated on how well they meet these goals and needs with the specific proposed systems, including:

- Garbage collection vehicles, procedures, and containers;
- Recycling collection vehicles, procedures and containers;
- Yard waste collection vehicles, procedures;
- Relevant yard waste composting facility operations, impacts and permitting; and
- Relevant recycle materials processing facility operations, impacts and permitting.

3. **Proposed Customer Implementation, Outreach and Relations (15%)** - The City seeks Proposals that would proactively address customer needs, minimize customer confusion and complaints, and increase recycling and yard waste diversion. Specifically, Proposers will be evaluated on:
   - Workability of proposed implementation plan,
   - Plan for providing public information to residents,
   - Experience with other implementations,
   - Samples of public information provided to residents,
   - Flexibility to change plan as needs arise,
   - Ability to assist the City with annual recycling and clean-up events,
   - Strategies for increasing diversion through recycling and yard programs, and
   - Proposed performance standards and monitoring for customer relations and quality of service.

4. **Total System Price (40%)** - The City seeks Proposals that will provide the lowest overall system costs, including the collection and processing of all waste streams. Specifically, Proposals will be evaluated on:
   - Proposed service prices,
   - Total system costs, and
   - Viability of financial projections.

G. Interviews and Presentations

The City has the option of requesting presentations by Proposers during Phase 2 - *Proposal Review*. Interviews will be in closed meetings. If interviews are held, the Evaluation Committee will prior to the interview submit to the finalists a list of questions and issues to be addressed during the interview.

H. City Investigation and Inspections

The City reserves the right to make independent investigations as to the qualification of the Proposer. Such investigation may include site visits to existing operations.

I. Evaluation Committee's Recommendation

Upon completion of its evaluation, the Evaluation Committee will make its recommendation to the Shoreline City Council. The recommendation may include

negotiating with those Proposers that demonstrated the best match with the evaluation criteria or to reject all Proposals.

J. Public Documents and Disclosure

While the City has no plans to publish Proposals and other information provided by any Proposer, pursuant to RCW Ch. 42.17, the City may be required to publicly disclose to third parties any Proposals and materials submitted by Proposers. In order to preserve the integrity of the procurement process, it is the City's intent to release no information prior to the conclusion of the procurement process unless ordered to do so by law.

RCW Ch. 42.17 provides limited exemptions from this general disclosure requirement. If a Proposer believes that portions of its Proposal are exempt from disclosure to third parties, the Proposer must clearly label the specific portions sought to be kept confidential and specify the exemption that the Proposer is relying upon. Marking all or substantially all of a Proposal as confidential may result in the Proposal being considered non-responsive by the City.

The City will not be responsible or liable in any way for any losses that the Proposer may suffer from the disclosure of information or materials to third parties, and by submitting a proposal, the Proposer waives any such claims against the City.

K. Reservations and Limitations

1. **Authority to Accept or Reject Proposals** - The City reserves the following rights (as well as rights granted to the City under applicable law): to reject all Proposals; to discontinue its negotiations after commencing negotiations with a finalist, if progress is unsatisfactory, and commence discussions with another Proposer; to contract with those finalists, who in combination produce the most advantageous result; to accept and negotiate Proposals to collect garbage and collect, process and market yard waste and recyclables in the best interest of the City.

2. **Proposer's Self Reliance** - Proposers are expected to be knowledgeable about the accounts to be served, to understand the City's terrain, streets and alleys, and locations for detachable and other containers used for garbage, yard waste, recycling, and food waste collection. Proposers are expected to determine the appropriate equipment to provide the required services.

3. **Proposer's Responsibility for Costs** - The City will not reimburse any Proposer for any costs involved in the preparation and submission of Proposals, in making an oral presentation, or in contract negotiations.

4. **Submission of Proposal** - All Proposals must be valid for six months after submission. Proposers may be requested to extend their Proposals for an additional period of time.

Chapter V - Proposal Instructions

Proposers should carefully follow the instructions in this chapter for communicating and submitting Proposals. To be responsive, Proposals should be completed, organized and submitted as described in this Chapter.

A. Initial Communications

All communications regarding this RFP must be made in written form (including mail, email or fax) to the Project Manager:

The City of Shoreline
Attention: Kristoff T. Bauer
17544 Midvale Ave. N
Shoreline, Washington 98133-4921

Telephone: 206-546-1297
Fax: 206-546-2200
Email: kbauer@ci.shoreline.wa.us

1. **Letter of Intent *(required)*** - Proposers must submit a Letter of Intent by June 9, 2000. A sample Letter of Intent is provided with this RFP as **Exhibit B**. All firms that submit a Letter of Intent will receive any additional information sent to potential Proposers.

2. **Proposers' Questions to the City *(optional)*** - Proposers may submit questions and clarification requests in writing to the Project Manager. All questions received by May 31, 2000 will be circulated with responses at the Proposers' Conference. The City will also respond to questions of general interest at the conference.

   Questions will continue to be accepted by the City throughout the process, but the City may not respond to questions received after May 31, 2000. Responses, if provided, will be distributed to all parties submitting a Letter of Intent, without identifying the party submitting the questions.

   All questions and clarification requests should be made to the Project Manager. Unless authorized by the Project Manager, no other City official or employee is empowered to speak for the City with respect to this RFP. Proposers who contact other City officials or employees in regard to this RFP may be disqualified.

3. **Proposers' Conference *(optional)*** - The City may hold a Proposers' Conference on June 6, 2000, from 1:30 - 5:00 p.m. at Shoreline City Hall in the third floor conference room.

4. **Service Area Visits *(optional)*** - Proposers may visit the collection areas and transfer facilities and identify customer structures. Proposers must initiate their own inspections and research.

B. Submitting Proposals

All submitted Proposals are required to cover the collection of garbage, yard waste, and recyclables, and processing and marketing of yard waste and recyclables.

1. **Deadline** - All Proposals, with all required copies, must be received by the Project Manager, Kristoff T. Bauer, at the address listed above, on or before **2:00 p.m. on June 23, 2000.**

2. **Copies** - Proposers will compile and submit one signed original plus 5 collated copies of their Proposal. Please use recycled paper and double sided printing. You may make a machine reproduction of any forms - *from the original hard copies* - and submit the reproduced forms with your Proposal. All price forms must be on **green** paper and forms for Alternative Proposals must be submitted on **blue** paper for mandatory and **yellow** paper for permissive alternatives.

3. **Format** - Proposals must respond to all required and relevant questions (see **Chapter VI - Proposal Questions)** and complete all required and relevant forms (see **Chapter VII - Proposal Forms)**. Proposers will list each evaluation question before the corresponding response and maintain the order and numbering of the questions from the RFP. Completed forms should be included at the end of each relevant section, as described below. **All proposals must be clearly organized and labeled in seven separate sections:**

   Section 1. Summary
   In Section 1 of the Proposal, Proposers will briefly outline:
   - the strengths of Proposer,
   - the Base Service Proposal,
   - any Alternative Proposals,
   - the benefits of the proposed services.

   Section 2. Certification
   In Section 2, Proposers will complete, sign, and authorize **Form 1 Proposers Commitment** and **Form 2 Surety's Intent**.

   Section 3. Background
   In Section 3, Proposers will describe ownership, key staff, and past performance, including:
   a) Responses to all background questions in **Chapter VI - Proposal Questions, Section A** and

   b) **Forms 3 and 4** listing a key contact and describing principle staff.

Section 4. Proposed Operations for Base Services

In Section 4, Proposers will describe the relevant proposed operations, equipment, staff and facilities, including:

a) Responses to all operations questions in **Chapter VI - Proposal Questions, Section B;**

b) **Form 5** describing proposed vehicles and operations; and

c) **Forms 6-7** describing proposed facility use.

Section 5. Proposed Implementation and Customer Relations

In Section 5, Proposers will describe proposed outreach, communication methods, and enforcement, including complete responses to all questions in **Section C of Chapter VI - Proposal Questions.**

Section 6. Proposed Prices for Base Services

In Section 6, Proposers will list all required prices and any desired optional prices, including:

a) Any narrative required to explain prices; and

b) **Form 8 (on Green paper)** with *all* collection prices including applicable King County tiping fees and costs for processing and marketing yard waste and recyclables.

Section 7. Proposed Alternatives

In Section 7, Proposers will complete the following components for *each* Alternative Proposal:

a) Narrative description of the proposed alternative (*Mandatory on **blue**, optional on **yellow** paper*);

b) Complete prices on **Form 8** and any additional prices and/or narrative to fully explain the proposed costs and savings, *on **green** paper*; and

c) Responses to any and all questions or forms that would be different from the Base Proposal response *on **blue** or **yellow** paper as appropriate.*

Chapter VI - Proposal Questions

The evaluation questions must be answered for all Proposals. The questions were developed to directly support Proposal evaluation and the evaluation criteria. Please read the evaluation criteria to fully understand the City's priorities in evaluating Proposals and selecting a contractor.

This entire set of questions must be completed for your Base Proposal. For any Alternative Proposals, provide new responses when the response would differ from the Base Proposal on **blue** or **yellow** paper as appropriate.

List the question before each answer. An answer to a question may refer to a document or page where the information may be found without repeating it, provided that any document referred to must be submitted with the Proposal. A cross-reference may be made if the answer to one question also appears in an answer to another.

A. Background and Past Performance

The City wishes to enter into a long-term stable relationship with a collection firm that shares the collection principles outlined in **Chapter I - Overview**. Therefore, we are seeking contractors with secure and reliable financial standing, limited past litigation problems, extensive and successful service delivery, state of art equipment and management, high customer and client satisfaction and a strong record of environmental compliance.

1. **Proposer and Surety Commitment** - Complete **Form 1** and **Form 2** acknowledging commitments regarding this proposal and potential ensuing contracts.

2. **Contact information** - Complete **Form 3** regarding the company and partners.

3. **Key employees** - Complete **Form 4** with background on key employees for the Proposer and all subcontractors.

4. **Litigation history** - Explain fully any litigation within the past seven years involving any company, partner, holding company, or subsidiary in this venture, or any corporate officer, including litigation:
   - arising out of performance of a solid waste or recycling collection contract;
   - arising out of performance of a recycling or yard waste processing or marketing contract;
   - arising from or connected with violation of state or federal anti-trust laws; or
   - arising from or connected with allegation of corrupt practices.

5. **Financial strength** - Attach a balance sheet, income statement and statement of the sources and uses of funds for the most recent operating year for each of the

proposing firms or for the proposing joint venture. *[If the proposing entity is a new joint venture with insufficient history for requisite financial statements, then submit financial statements for each company in the joint venture. If Proposers wish to protect any of these statements from public disclosure, they should clearly label the statements as proprietary.]*

6. **Operational experience** - Answer questions a - e below describing your firm's relevant experience. For *each* questions provide the following detailed information:
    - duration of the program;
    - collection systems;
    - annual tonnage;
    - number of structures and units served;
    - problems in establishing and providing service;
    - experience in implementing changes;
    - actions taken to resolve problems;
    - experience in providing customer service;
    - average daily complaint rate (including missed collections);
    - evidence of customer and jurisdiction satisfaction; and
    - reference contacts at jurisdiction.

    a) Residential garbage collection from cans and detachable containers.

    b) Residential collection of yard waste (include transfer, processing and marketing of yard waste).

    c) Residential collection of recyclable materials from single-family structures (curb collection) and multi-family structures (include transfer, processing and marketing of recyclables).

    d) Collection of residential and/or commercial garbage as a contract collection firm.

7. **Commercial experience** - Provide the relevant bulleted information requested in question 6 above, for each of the following services:

    a) Experience collecting commercial garbage from cans, detachable containers and roll-offs.

    b) Experience collecting commercial recyclable materials (include transfer, processing and marketing of recyclables).

    c) Experience collecting commercial construction, demolition and land clearing waste.

    d) Experience providing customer service and billing services to customers.

e) Measures and equipment used to reduce collection noise impacts, especially during nighttime hours.

8. **Environmental performance** - The City desires to partner with a contractor that has a strong environmental record and that has experience in solving environmental issues in a timely manner. Therefore, describe any regulatory complaints or violations related to your solid waste operations received within the last seven years. Provide evidence of successful mitigation of environmental and community impacts from your solid waste operations.

B. Operations

The City seeks innovative and responsive Proposals that improve system efficiency, keep costs down, allow flexible and increased access to services, meet customer needs, reduce impacts on public and environmental health, and provide long-term service stability.

Collection

1. **Garbage collection from cans**
   a) Describe proposed collection vehicles and procedures for collecting garbage (include photographs and the make, model, chassis, and age range of proposed fleet).

   b) Complete **Form 5** describing estimated number of routes.

   c) Describe the style and brand of initial and replacement garbage cans (20, 32, 60, and 90-gallon). State the percent of recycled content in the cans.

   d) List your experience with this type of collection system including collection from micro (12 gallon) cans

2. **Garbage collection from detachable containers**
   a) Describe proposed collection vehicles and procedures for collections from detachable containers (include photographs and the make, model, chassis, and age range of proposed fleet).

   b) Complete **Form 5** describing the estimated number of routes.

   c) List your experience with this type of collection system.

3. **Yard waste collection**
   a) Describe proposed collection vehicles and procedures for collecting yard waste (include photographs and the make, model, chassis, and age range of proposed fleet).

   b) Complete **Form 5** describing the estimated number of routes.

   c) How would you prevent contamination (such as plastics) from being collected with yard waste?

   d) List your experience with this type of collection system.

4. **Curb recycling collection**
   a) Describe proposed collection vehicles and procedures for collecting recyclables (include photographs and the make, model, chassis, and age range of proposed fleet).

   b) Complete **Form 5** describing number of routes.

   c) Describe the style and brand of collection containers you will use, including:
      - number necessary to perform the service;
      - the style, brand and size of containers;
      - percent of recycled content in the containers;
      - minimum space your collection containers require; and
      - volume of material they will hold.

   d) How would you prevent contamination from being collected with recyclables?

   e) List your experience with this type of collection system.

5. **Centralized apartment and commercial recycling**
   a) Describe proposed collection vehicles and procedures for collecting recyclables from multi-family and commercial structures (include photographs and the make, model, chassis, and age range of proposed fleet).

   b) Complete **Form 5** describing the estimated number of routes.

   c) How would you prevent contamination from being collected with recyclables?

   d) List your experience with this type of collection system.

6. **Flexible customer allocation** - New Contractors will provide of curb containers to all residents with garbage can service. Contractor will then be allowed to provide the types of services to residential structures that are most appropriate for each situation. How would you identify the buildings that should receive a change in service and

notify the residents or building owner of any changes?

7. **Collection staff training** - What are your minimum training and experience requirements for collection personnel? Describe your safety training program.

8. **Collection procedures enforcement** - The contract specifications place particular emphasis on the manner in which material is collected, including placing lids back on or in containers and putting containers back where they were placed before collection in a neat and orderly manner, after they are emptied. Please describe the training and corrective measures you will employ with collection personnel to ensure that containers are not abused and are replaced properly. What tracking or monitoring mechanism will you use to ensure that collection personnel are following proper procedures?

9. **Enforcing service levels and extras** - Please provide us with a detailed description of monitoring procedures you would use to ensure that your collection personnel are collecting the right subscription level from each household, as well as correctly recording excess garbage and yard waste. What follow-up steps would you take with individual collection personnel who are found not monitoring correctly, or who do not have current subscription information?

10. **Environmental and neighborhood impacts** - The City is interested in ensuring that the environmental and neighborhood impacts of collection are minimized. Specific concerns include traffic, noise, odor and other air quality impacts. Please describe how these impacts will be mitigated, and any other strategies for protecting environmental quality, such as clean fuels, etc.

11. **Collection facilities** - Describe the facilities where you propose to site and maintain your vehicles, store container inventories, and perform any other functions (e.g., administration and billing) to support your garbage, yard waste, and recycling collection operations. Please provide location(s) and describe the surrounding neighborhood(s), and indicate the status of any permits that these facilities require from the City and/or other regulatory agencies. Summarize any correspondence from regulatory agencies relating to your facilities or operations. Have your facilities been found in violation of any permits or other regulatory requirements? If so, what was the permit or regulatory infraction and how was it resolved?

Transfer

Base Proposals need to include transfer for recyclables and yard waste materials. Please answer the following questions:

12. **Yard waste transfer** - Describe fully the proposed transfer systems.

13. **Recycling transfer** - Describe fully the proposed transfer systems.

Processing and Marketing

Proposals need to include processing and marketing of recyclable and yard waste materials. Please answer the following questions:

The City wishes to partner with a contractor that is committed to minimizing environmental impacts. These questions are meant to gauge the environmental and community impacts of any proposed processing facilities.

15. Yard waste processing facility

a) Describe your proposed processing facilities, methods and operations.

b) Complete **Form 6** describing current and anticipated future facility flow.

c) Identify key personnel that will be committed to facility management and their experience with organics processing.

d) Describe past operating experience with the processing method you would use for handling yard waste received under a City contract. Include location, length of time facility has been in operation, feedstocks and tonnages received, and evidence of successful product marketing.

16. Yard waste permitting

a) If this is an existing facility, provide copies of existing SEPA documentation, building permits, and health department operating permits, and any other permits, environmental review or approvals required and their status. Document that your operations are in compliance with all existing permits.

b) If this is a new proposed facility, provide your anticipated schedule for submitting and receiving approval for SEPA documentation, building permits, health department operating permits and any other permits or approvals required.

17. Recyclable materials processing facility

a) Describe your proposed processing facilities, methods and operations.

b) Complete **Form 7** describing material quantities and flow

18. Recycling facility permitting

a) If this is an existing facility, provide copies of existing SEPA documentation, building permits, and health department operating permits, and any other permits, environmental review or approvals required and their status. Document that your operations are in compliance with all existing permits.

b) If this is a new proposed facility, provide your anticipated schedule for submitting and receiving approval for SEPA documentation, building permits, health department operating permits and any other permits or approvals required.

19. **Marketing plans** - Describe your past experience and your proposed marketing plans of finished products for:
    a) yard waste; and

    b) each recyclable material.

Employment Practices

20. **Safety** - Describe the safety and training plans at all facilities?

C. Customer Implementation, Outreach and Relations

The City seeks Proposals that would proactively address and minimize customer confusion and complaints in both the short- and long-term.

Coordination of Implementation

Minimizing disruptions and changes in collection services during implementation (for any existing waste streams affected) is of paramount importance in this transition. Your responses below should address your strategies for minimizing customer concerns and confusion.

1. **Initial containers and collection schedule** - Describe the your proposed process for providing containers, changing collection frequencies, and changing the days of collection for all services. Describe the stages and timeline for these changes, including any arrangements necessary with the existing contractor. Describe proposed strategies for minimizing changes in containers and collection days from the current contracts.

2. **Apartment recycling containers** - How will you ensure that buildings have a smooth transition to the new collection system? How would you inform building owners/managers and building residents of changes in how material is to be prepared? How would you ensure that new apartment containers are located on the premises in a manner satisfactory to the building owner/manager?

3. **Communication with City** - It will be extremely important for the contractor to keep the City informed of the status of implementation, any proposed changes to the implementation plan, and to work with City staff in resolving problems. Therefore, describe your Proposal for communicating with City staff to keep them adequately informed of implementation progress, problems, your attempts to solve problems, and to elicit City staff assistance in solving service related problems.

Implementation Public Information

The Contractor is responsible for informing customers of any changes in their collection day; for providing information on how to use containers delivered by the contractor; what materials can and cannot be recycled; how material is to be prepared; collection frequency, and other related information.

4. **Container labels** - Describe the information that will be displayed on your containers and how this information will be displayed and maintained. This information should include what materials go into which containers and which do not, collection days, and other information that promotes full customer participation in the collection programs.

5. **Customer outreach methods** - The Base Proposal requires that information be provided to affected households via container labels and an information sheet attached to delivered containers. Describe additional methods you would use to inform residents of solid waste collection changes

6. **Public information staff** - Describe the qualifications of your Publicity and Education Director including previous experience in working with solid waste collection programs and government organizations. Explain your procedures for submitting public information material to the City for approval and any approval timelines you would expect the City to meet.

7. **City outreach** - Describe your expectations of the City in helping to keep customers informed of changes in the collection services.

Program Participation

8. **Increasing curb recycling and yard waste diversion** - The City has a goal of diverting 60% or greater of the waste from garbage can customers in 2008 through recycling, yard waste and waste reduction programs. How would your Proposal help the City meet this goal?

9. **Increasing apartment and business participation and diversion** - The City has a goal of increasing participation in the centralized apartment recycling programs and increasing diversion from garbage detached container customers. What measures do you propose to take to measure the effectiveness of current activities and to increase awareness, reduce owner concerns, and increase participation and diversion?

On-Going Customer Relations

10. **Repeat complaint enforcement** - The City plans to charge contractors for each complaint received by the City. Repeat complaints, or complaints not resolved in a timely manner are of special concern. Therefore, please propose contract language that could include increased penalties for repeat complaints.

11. **Customer communication** - Describe the procedures you would use and the information you would provide in addressing customer problems, such as contamination or overweight containers, at a particular service location?

12. **Collection Location and Private Drives** - Describe the procedures you would use to identify and inform customers of the appropriate collection location, and your policies and procedures for private drives, cul-de-sacs, or limited access problems.

13. **Customer & driver disputes** - Occasionally there are disputes between collection drivers and the public. What kind of training do you provide your collection personnel to avoid these types of problems? What disciplinary measures will you take if your collection personnel are rude or abusive toward the public?

D. Price Proposals

The City seeks Proposals that will provide the lowest overall system costs.

1. For Base Proposals, provide all required prices and any optional prices that are desired on **Form 8.**

2. For Alternative Proposals, provide relevant prices on **Form 8** and any additional prices and/or narrative to fully explain the proposed costs and savings on the appropriate color of paper.

Chapter VII - Proposal Forms

Proposers should organize all completed forms in the format outlined in ***Chapter V, Section B Submitting Proposals.*** Form 5 Collection Operations and Form 8 Service Prices may need to be duplicated and completed separately for different service types or alternate proposals as appropriate.

Proposers must complete all required and applicable forms for their Base Proposal:

Certification forms include *(signature and authorization required)*:

- Form 1 Proposer Commitment*(required) and*
- Form 2 Surety Intent *(required).*

Background forms include:

- Form 3 Proposal Contact *(required) and*
- Form 4 Principal Staff *(required).*

Operations forms include:

- Form 5 Collection Operations *(required);*
- Form 6 Yard Waste Facility *(required)*; and
- Form 7 Recycling Facility *(required).*

Price forms include:

- Form 8 Service Prices *(required)*.

For Alternative Proposals, Proposers must complete separate versions of Form 8 Service Prices and any Operations forms that would have different responses than the Base Proposal. Alternate Proposals shall be submitted on the appropriate color of paper; i.e. **blue** for mandatory alternates, **yellow** for optional alternates, and Form 8 on **green**.

A. Certification Forms

Both certification forms must be completed, signed and authorized. The completed forms should list the Proposer and Alternative (enter "Base") at the top of the forms. These forms only need to be completed once to cover the Base and all Alternative Proposals.

Form 1 Proposer Commitment

In Form 1, the Proposer testifies that they have not participated in any collusion or anti-competitive practices during the preparation and submitting of the Proposal. In addition, the Proposer commits to the operations and prices set forth in the Proposal. The Proposer also acknowledges of receipt of all addenda by including each addenda number on Form 1.

Proposals by corporations shall be executed in the corporate name by the president or a vice president authorized to sign, and the corporate seal shall be affixed and attested by the secretary or an assistant secretary. The corporate address shall be shown below the signature. All names shall be typed or printed below the signature(s).

Proposals by partnerships shall include the official business address of the partnership, and the state of organization shall be shown below the signature. Proposals by a joint venture shall be similarly executed by all joint venture partners.

Form 2 Surety Intent

Form 2 must be completed, signed, and authorized by the company that will provide the required bonds to the Proposer. The surety testifies that the bonds will be issued if the contract is awarded to the Proposer.

Proposer_____ Alternative_____

Form 1 Proposer Commitment *(required)*

STATE OF)
)SS.
COUNTY OF)

I, _____ of the City of _____, in the County of _____ and State of _____, of full age, being duly sworn on oath depose and say that:

I am _____ of the firm of _____, the Proposer making the Proposal for Residential Solid Waste Services, and that I executed the said Proposal with full authority so to do; that said Proposer has not, directly or indirectly, entered into any agreement, participated in any collusion, or otherwise taken any action in restraint of free, competitive bidding in connection with the Services; that all statements contained in said Proposal and in this affidavit are true and correct, and made with full knowledge that the City of Shoreline relies upon the truth of the statements contained in said Proposal and in the statements contained in this affidavit in awarding Contracts for the said Services.

I understand the Proposal requirements and the contract specifications and has based its Proposal on the provisions and specifications detailed in this Request for Proposals.

I have submitted all Proposal Forms which are incorporated into this Proposal by this reference.

I further certify :

a: that neither the Proposer nor any member of the Proposer's team is currently suspended or debarred from doing business with any government entity;

b: that the Proposer has reviewed all of its engagements and pending engagements and that, in making this Proposal, no potential for conflict of interest or unfair advantage exists;

c: that the information supplied by the Proposer in this Proposal is current, truthful and complete;

Having carefully examined the Project Documents comprising the RFP and all other documents bound therewith, together with all Addenda thereto, all information made available by the City, and being familiar with the work and the various conditions affecting the work, the undersigned hereby offers to furnish all labor, vehicles, facilities, equipment, supplies and things necessary or proper or incidental to the contract operations as required by and in strict accordance with the applicable provisions of this RFP and of all Addenda issued by the City.

Proposer_____ Alternative_____

I acknowledge receipt of addenda:

Addendum No.	Addendum date
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

I further warrant that no person or selling agency has been employed or retained to solicit or secure such Contract upon an agreement or understanding for a commission, percentage, brokerage or contingent fee, except bona fide employees or bona fide established commercial or selling agencies maintained by _____.

_____

(Signature of Proposer)

Note: *If this Proposal is being* ***submitted by a corporation****, the Proposal shall be executed in the corporate name by the president or other corporate officer, and the corporate seal shall be affixed and attested to by the clerk. A certificate of the clerk of the corporation evidencing the officer's authority to execute the Proposal shall be attached. If this Proposal is being* ***submitted by a joint venture****, it shall be executed by all joint venture Partners, and any partner that is a corporation shall follow the requirements for execution by a corporation as set forth above.*

(NOTARY PUBLIC)

State of _____

County of _____

On this _____ day of _____, 19____, before me appeared _____, personally known to me to be the person described in and who executed this _____ and acknowledged that (she/he) signed the same freely and voluntarily for the uses and purposes therein described.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal the day and year last written above.

_____
Notary Public in and for the state of Washington

(seal)

_____
(Name printed)

Residing at _____

My appointment expires_____

Proposer_____ Alternative_____

Form 2 Surety Intent *(required)*

TO: **CITY OF SHORELINE**

We have reviewed the Proposal of_____
(Contractor)

of _____
(Address)

for the following contract:

CITY OF SHORELINE
Solid Waste Services

We understand that Proposals will be received until _____ on _____, 2000, and wish to advise that should this Proposal be accepted and the Contract awarded to the Contractor listed above, it is our present intention to become surety on the Performance bond required by the Contract.

Any arrangement for the Bonds required by the Contract is a matter between the contractor and ourselves and we assume no liability to the owner or third parties if for any reason we do not execute the requisite bonds.

We are duly licensed to do business in the State of Washington.

Dated:_____ By: _____
(Name of Surety

_____
(Name of Signatory) (Title)

(Seal) _____(signature)

B. Background Forms

Proposers must complete both background forms. The completed forms should list the Proposer, and Alternative (enter "Base") at the top of the forms. These forms only need to be completed once to cover the Base and all Alternative Proposals.

Form 3 Proposal Contact *(required)*
Form 3 lists the home office and local addresses of the Proposer, the primary contact person for communications with the City during the Proposal selection process, and the partners and subcontractors in the Proposal.

Form 4 Principal Staff *(required)*
Form 4 identifies the principal officers and relevant managers of the Proposer and any partners or subcontractors in this Proposal. The principal staff should also include additional partners or subcontractors that are involved in Alternative Proposals. Proposers should attach resumes for all principal staff and graphical representation of interrelationships between team members.

Proposer_____ Alternative_____

Form 3 Proposal Contact (*required*)

a) Company:_____
Home office address:_____
City:_____ State:____ Zip:_____

Washington address (if any): _____
City:_____ State:____ Zip:_____

b) Contact person for this proposal:
Name:_____ Phone:_____
Title: _____ Fax:_____
Address: _____ Email:_____
City:_____ State:____ Zip:_____

c) Partners and major subcontracting companies

Company _____
Owner _____ Phone:_____
Role in proposed contract_____

Company _____
Owner _____ Phone:_____
Role in proposed contract_____

Company_____
Owner _____ Phone:_____
Role in proposed contract_____

Company _____
Owner _____ Phone:_____
Role in proposed contract_____

Company _____
Owner _____ Phone:_____
Role in proposed contract_____

Proposer_____ Alternative_____

Form 4 Principal Staff *(required)*

a. Proposer

Principal officers	Title

Principal individuals responsible for implementation in Shoreline.	Title

[Attach resumes for all listed staff.]

b) Partners and subcontractors

Principal officers	Title	Company

Principal individuals responsible for implementation in Shoreline.	Title	Company

[Attach resumes for all listed staff.]

Attach an organization chart or other means of explaining the interrelationships between the team members.

C. Operations Forms

Proposers must describe collection operations in Form 5, and all facilities related to proposed processing in Forms 6-7. The top of each form should contain the Proposer and Alternative.

Form 5 Collection Operations *(required)*

The Proposer must complete this form for all of Shoreline with the understanding that authority and responsibility to provide service within annexation collection areas will begin upon the future dates indicated:

- Annexation Area A 1 – February 26, 2002
- Annexation Area A 2 – August 1, 2006
- Annexation Area A 3 – November 27, 2005

Additional collection operations forms should be completed for all Alternative Proposals. The top of each form should include the Proposer and Alternative (enter "Base" for Base Services). Clearly note where trucks are used for more than one waste stream. Proposer should provide detailed descriptions of collection vehicles and procedures in responses to the questions in **Chapter VI, Section B**.

Form 6 Yard Waste Facility

The Proposer should complete this form for each facility that is proposed. The top of each form should include the Proposer and Alternative (enter "Base" for Base Services).

Form 7 Recycling Facility

The Proposer should complete this form for each facility that is proposed. The top of each form should include the Proposer and Alternative (enter "Base" for Base Services).

Proposer_____ Alternative_____

Form 5: Proposed Collection Operations *(required)*

a) Collection

Trucks & Routes	Garbage		Recycling		Yard Waste
	Cans	Containers	Curb	Centralized	
Container tipping (front,rear,or side)					
Compartments/ truck					
Staff/truck					
Routes/week					
Structures/route					
Transfer location: KCSW (% of tons) Other (% of tons)	NA	NA			

Proposer_____ Alternative_____

Form 6 Yard Waste Facility

Location:_____ Operating company:_____

Materials facility is permitted to accept:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Materials facility is prohibited from accepting:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Projected Feedstocks and Capacity

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Project avg. Daily tons Shoreline contract (%) Other sources (%)								
Peak daily tons (Spring) Shoreline contract (%) Other sources (%)								
Avg. trucks/day								
Feedstock: Yard waste (%) Wood waste (%) Manure (%) Biosolids (%) Food waste (%) Other (%)								
Truck type: Long-haul container (%) Collection trucks (%) Self-haul vehicles (%)								

If facility is not in King, Pierce, or Snohomish Counties:
What will be the long-haul method? ____% trucks _____ % trains
What railheads will be used? _____

What are your tonnage limits from Health Department permits?
_____ through what year? _____

What are your are your facility limitations from SEPA and other environmental review?
_____ through what year?_____

Proposer_____ Alternative_____

Form 7 Recycling Facility

Location:_____ Operating company: _____

Materials facility is permitted to accept:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Materials facility is prohibited from accepting:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Projected Feedstocks and Capacity

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Project avg. daily tons Shoreline contract (%) Other sources (%)								
Avg. trucks/day								
Recyclables source: Residential (%) Commercial (%)								
Truck type: Long-haul container (%) Collection trucks (%) Self-haul vehicles (%)								

If facility is not in King, Pierce, or Snohomish Counties:
What transfer station(s) will be used?_____
What will be the long-haul method? ____% trucks _____ % trains
What railheads will be used? _____

What are your tonnage limits from Health Department permits?
_____ through what year? _____

What are your are your facility limitations from SEPA and other environmental review?
_____ through what year? _____

D. Price Form

Proposer must complete *all collection prices* on Form 8 for Base Services. At the top of all forms, identify the Proposer, Alternative, and collection area. *All price forms must be submitted on **green** paper.*

Form 8 Collection and Processing Prices *(required)*
All prices are for the contract base year from September 2000 to August 2001.

For the Base Proposal, identify the Alternative as "Base" for all of Shoreline with the understanding that authority and responsibility to provide service within annexation collection areas will begin upon the future dates indicated:

- Annexation Area A 1 – February 26, 2002
- Annexation Area A 2 – August 1, 2006
- Annexation Area A 3 – November 27, 2005

Additional versions of **Form 8** must be completed for all Alternatives Proposals, along with additional prices and/or narrative that fully explain Proposal costs and savings.

Proposer_____ Alternative_____

Form 8 Service Prices - *(required)*

a) COLLECTION PRICES FOR BASE YEAR (9/00 - 8/01)

Complete ALL PRICES for Base Proposal. *These collection prices assume that the Proposer would collect all services in the service area.*

Proposer: _____
Alternative: _____

Residential Solid Waste and Recyclable Collection Rates:

Rate Category	Rate	Charge Frequency
10 Gallon Mini Can		
20 Gallon Mini Can		
One 32 Gallon Can		
Two 32 Gallon Cans		
Three 32 Gallon Cans		
Four 32 Gallon Cans		
Five 32 Gallon Cans		
32 Gallon Toter		
60 Gallon Toter		
90 Gallon Toter		
1 Can Per Month		
Extra Unit		

Residential Yard Waste Collection Rates:

Service Frequency: Bi-Weekly (March – October) Monthly (November – February)

Rate Category	Rate (Mar-Oct)	Rate (Nov-Feb)
90 Gallon Toter		
Extra Unit		

Proposer_____ Alternative_____

Commercial Solid Waste and Recyclable Collection Rates:

Solid Waste Container Size	Standard Service Rate*	Extra Collection – Pickups per Week				Extra Service On-Call
		2	3	4	5	
32 Gallon Toter						
60 Gallon Toter						
90 Gallon Toter						
1 Cubic Yard						
1.25 Cubic Yards						
1.5 Cubic Yards						
2 Cubic Yards						
3 Cubic Yards						
4 Cubic Yards						
6 Cubic Yards						
8 Cubic Yards						
3 Cubic Yard Compactor						

*Same as Residential rate for same container size.

Commercial Yard Waste Collection Rates:

Rate Category	Rate (Mar-Oct)	Rate (Nov-Feb)
1 Cubic Yard		
2 Cubic Yard		
90 Gallon Toter		

Drop Box Rates:

Container Size	Rental Rate	Pickup Rate
10 Cubic Yards		
15 Cubic Yards		
20 Cubic Yards		
25 Cubic Yards		
30 Cubic Yards		
40 Cubic Yards		

Compactor Rates (Customer Furnished):

Container Size	Pickup Rate
10 Cubic Yards	
15 Cubic Yards	
20 Cubic Yards	
25 Cubic Yards	
30 Cubic Yards	
35 Cubic Yards	
40 Cubic Yards	

Proposer_____ Alternative_____

Rates For Special Services / Conditions:

Service / Condition	Monthly Rate (Residential)	Monthly Rate (Commercial)
Carry Outs (Over 5 to 25 Feet) Each Additional 25 Feet		
Stairs and Steps (For Each Step)		
Overhead Obstructions (Less Than 8 Feet From Ground)		
Sunken or Elevated Cans / Units Cans or Units Under or Above Ground Over 4 Feet But Not Involving Steps or Stair		
Drive-ins (Only One Can) Private Road or Driveways Over 125 Feet		

Bulky items pick-up $_____/item

White goods pick-up $_____/item

Proposer initials _____

The following documents are not attached: Copies of each are available to the general public at the Office of the City Clerk, and to the City Council in the Council Office.

EXHIBIT A - SOLID WASTE COLLECTION AND PROCESSING CONTRACT

EXHIBIT B - LETTER OF INTENT

EXHIBIT C - SAMPLE RATE ADJUSTMENTS

CITY OF SHORELINE

City of Shoreline

Figure 1

Solid Waste Collection Areas

Figure 1



Waterbody
Street Class
Residential
Arterial
I-5
Beach.shp
Public Park
ANNEXATION AREAS
A-1 - Feb 26, 2002
A-2 - Nov 27, 2005
A-3 - Aug 1, 2006
Initial Service Area - Sept. 1, 2000

N

1 Inch = 0.44 Miles

0 0.22 0.44 0.66 0.88 Miles