

Questions Received and Answers Regarding the RFP for Municipal Solid Waste and Construction and Demolition Waste Studies (DEEP-MMCA-0112015)

CT Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Link to RFP: http://www.biznet.ct.gov/SCP_Search/BidDetail.aspx?CID=34636

1. The MSW characterization scope notes that the new study should "...replicate the methodology of the 2010 study..." Since fewer samples will provide less accurate results, should we plan on completing the same number of MSW samples as in 2010 to provide robust statistical comparisons between the 2010 results and the new study results?

(Answer) Yes.

2. Providing a draft report by 10/1 while maintaining the same sampling schedule as the 2010 study (Spring and Fall) is a very tight timeline. Does Connecticut DEEP anticipate that they will be able to respond to data and assistance requests from the winning bidder quickly enough (within 48 hours) to realize that timeline?

(Answer) Yes. We understand the tight timeframe – the reason for the timeframe is that the Department will be working concurrently to revise the State Solid Waste Management Plan and would like to be able to use the draft report in that process as early as possible. A Department project manager will be assigned to expedite the department's response to data and assistance requests. The 48-hour turnaround suggested can be achieved.

3. Has DEEP notified stakeholders (facilities, haulers, processors, etc.) of the upcoming MSW and C&D characterization?

(Answer) DEEP has informed members of the Solid Waste Advisory Council (which includes many haulers and facility representatives), as well as the Materials Innovation and Recycling Authority (MIRA, formerly CRRRA). In addition, a link and brief summary of the RFP were published to various industry list-serves of which DEEP is a member. A more extensive announcement of the planned activities via various DEEP communications channels is to take place following the selection of contractor(s).

4. Has DEEP secured the assistance of the necessary stakeholders (provide sort locations, notify ICI generators of interest)?

(Answer) No. We are waiting until the selection of a contractor but we anticipate actively assisting in securing the needed cooperation. We do expect the contractor to share in this effort as well.

5. Given the short timeframe between receiving answers to these questions and the proposal due date, would DEEP consider extending the proposal due date by one week?

(Answer) No.

6. Does DEEP have a budget in mind for the C&D characterization and market study?

(Answer) Our decision is not to indicate a budget amount during the RFP process.

7. If a Proposer plans to submit for both studies can they submit a single document with qualifications and references, but with separate scopes and budgets?

(Answer) Yes.

8. Is this project exempt from the requirements of CGS Sec. 4a-60g "Set-Aside program for small contractors, minority business enterprises, individuals with disabilities and nonprofit corporations" or do they apply? If not exempt, does the small business need to be certified by the Department of Administrative Services, and does the contractor need to subcontract 25% of that 25% to minority and women small contractors also certified (as minority business enterprises by the Department of Administration)?

(Answer) No, the project is not exempt from this requirement. Note that the requirement applies only to subcontracted work.

Failure to comply with the 25% minority business subcontracting requirement will not result in the disqualification of a proposal if the bidder includes with their proposal a statement explaining their good-faith effort to comply and the reason(s) they are unable to do so.

9. Does CT DEEP expect that the Contractor will sample from the same five facilities as the previous waste characterization study? If so, will CT DEEP assist in assuring access to those facilities again? If not, will CT DEEP work with the Contractor to identify suitable facilities, and assist with securing approval to sample at those facilities?

(Answer) For the MSW study, we expect the same facilities to be sampled, however if there is some reason to deviate we are not opposed. We anticipate securing the necessary assistance from facilities.

10. Does CT DEEP expect that cooperation can be obtained for the selected Contractor to perform waste characterization at volume reduction facilities/C&D processors? Will CT DEEP identify suitable facilities and assist Contractor in gaining access, or will this be the Contractor's responsibility?

(Answer) This responsibility will be shared. We anticipate identifying certain facilities but we expect that the contractor will identify other suitable facilities and solicit the cooperation of such facilities.

11. Is CT DEEP aware of any studies of road and bridge construction projects in CT that quantify construction wastes? Can CT DEEP identify the key State departments that would have access to major road and bridge construction projects?

(Answer) DEEP has no first-hand knowledge of this but expects that some information of this type may be obtained from the Department of Transportation.

12. What is the most recent year that CT DEEP has data on permitted volume reduction facilities, and from recycling facilities including scrap metal dealers? How complete are the data sets for that year?

(Answer) DEEP has C&D Volume Reduction Facility reports through December 2014 for permitted facilities. There may be facilities which have not submitted their 4th quarter 2014 reports. The first quarter 2015 reports (Jan 2015-Mar 2015) are not due until the end of April 2015. DEEP has scrap metal processor reports for FY2014 (July 2013-June 2014) – since this is a new scrap metal processor reporting program the reporting is probably incomplete.

13. Is CT DEEP satisfied with the allocation of residential and ICI waste developed during the previous Waste Characterization study, or does the Contractor need to conduct additional truck surveying to verify the allocation?

(Answer) Yes, DEEP was satisfied with the residential/ICI allocation that was developed.

14. The scope generally indicates that this study should “replicate the methodology” of the 2010 Study, plus some additional tasks. Please confirm that DEEP is satisfied with the seasonal representativeness, geographical/watershed coverage, and statistical accuracy of the 2010 Study, as these are the primary variables that, if modified, would impact the level of effort and budget needed to “replicate” the 2010 study.

(Answer) Yes, DEEP is satisfied with the seasonal representativeness, geographical/watershed coverage, and statistical accuracy of the 2010 Study.

15. Does “replicating the methodology” also include updated surveying of incoming vehicles to confirm/update the mix between residential and ICI waste?

(Answer) Yes.

16. Confirm that this update requires sampling and sorting of curbside collected single stream recyclables (in order to answer questions about contamination levels).

(Answer) Yes.

17. Please provide a list of sources of statewide waste and recycled material quantities that would be used to develop statewide aggregate quantities of disposed wastes, recyclables, and special wastes (tires, mattresses, paint, etc.).

(Answer) Please refer to various data reports at <http://www.ct.gov/deep/cwp/view.asp?a=2714&q=453366>

Note that data collection is not currently comprehensive enough to provide valid aggregate quantities of C&D wastes. We hope that the C&D study will yield estimates based on the limited available data, interviews, site visits, and other methods.

18. Are actual letters of reference required (i.e., something drafted and printed on the letterhead of a client), or will contact information and a project profile be sufficient?

(Answer) Based on the quick turnaround for proposals, we will not reject proposals on the basis of failing to provide recommendation letters if they instead provide the contact info and project profile instead.

Rev. 1/26/15