



# The Municipality of West Elgin

22413 Hoskins Line, Rodney, Ontario N0L 2C0

## Addendum #1

### REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

#### RFP 26-01

#### Question and Answer Summary - Clarification

**Q1.** The Municipality was asked “Is there a bag limit on Yard Waste?”

**Answer:** There is no limit to how many bags may be set out by residents and collected on Yard Waste collection days.

**Q2.** The Municipality was asked “Is there a limit to the number of bulk items that are placed to the curb for collection?”

**Answer:** Residents shall be limited to two (2) bulk items per each individual call-in.

**Q3.** The Municipality was asked “What the municipality consider a price per tonne for disposal of waste and processing yard waste?”

**Answer:** Please see the addition of Appendix C, included in this addendum for the amended pricing submission sheet.

**Q4.** The Municipality was asked “What is the frequency of the bulk collection?”

**Answer:** Bulk waste pickup shall be available to residents on a call-in basis, with a limit of three (3) call-ins per household per year. The Proponent shall be responsible for tracking the number of call-ins per household.

**Q5.** The Municipality was asked “Can the Municipality share where the 3 streams (waste, YW and bulk) of this RFP are currently being dumped?”

---

**Answer:** Bulky Item waste is not collected in the Municipality at this time.

Leaf and Yard materials are currently being disposed of at a registered site within the Municipality.

Garbage materials are currently being disposed of at a site owned and managed by the City of Toronto.

**Q6.** The Municipality was asked “Can the Municipality make the finish times 5:00 pm for all streams?”

**Answer:** The Municipality’s preference is that daily garbage collection be completed by no later than 4:00 pm to align with its business hours.

**Q7.** The Municipality was asked “Would the Municipality consider a 4-day collection schedule?”

**Answer:** Should the proponent wish to implement a 4-day collection schedule, they must clearly identify and provide a schedule for when each service area will be collected.

**Q8.** The Municipality was asked “Will the Municipality consider revising the renewal provision in Section 16.2 from sole discretion to mutual discretion?”

**Answer:** Renewal will remain at the sole discretion of the Municipality.

**Q9.** The Municipality was asked “Would the Municipality consider updating house counts more frequently, or at minimum on a quarterly basis, rather than annually?”

**Answer:** Considering the foreseen pace of population growth, the Municipality believes yearly house counts should suffice. If a sudden increase in household count is noted, provisions will be made.

**Q10.** The Municipality was asked “To properly scope equipment and personnel, could the Municipality provide the number of bulk garbage collection stops

---

completed in 2025, broken down by month? Additionally, is there a summary or listing of the types of bulk materials collected?”

**Answer:** Bulk garbage was not collected in the Municipality in 2025.

**Q11.** The Municipality was asked “Would the Municipality consider allowing proponents to propose limits or scheduling controls for bulk collection requests in instances where a high volume of requests are made simultaneously?”

**Answer:** The Municipality would consider two-week window for bulk item collection requests to be acceptable in the event that a large number of request or made. This possibility is not foreseen at this time.

**Q12.** The Municipality was asked “Provided that two personnel are assigned per collection vehicle, would the Municipality consider removing the requirement for residents to assist with loading bulk items?”

**Answer:** Yes, the Municipality would consider removing the requirement in such case.

**Q13.** The Municipality was asked “Can the Municipality confirm the specific disposal/processing location for leaf and yard waste and clarify whether disposal costs will be borne by the Municipality or the Proponent?”

**Answer:** The Municipality will bear all costs associated with the disposal of yard waste at the approved location within the Municipality.

**Q14.** The Municipality was asked “Can the Municipality confirm whether missed pickups may be recovered within 24 hours of being reported?”

**Answer:** The Municipality would consider a 24-hour window from missed collection pickups acceptable.

---

**Q15.** The Municipality was asked “Can the Municipality confirm whether full or partial route delays due to items like weather can be recovered within the week, including Saturdays?”

**Answer:** In the event of severe weather delays, it would be considered acceptable for collection to be completed on an alternative day within the week, provided that notice is given to the Municipality prior to 8:30 am on the day collection is to be missed.

**Q16.** The Municipality was asked “Can the Municipality confirm the current annual cost of the existing collection services contract? Alternatively, can the Municipality provide a link to the relevant Council agenda or budget documents where the approved 2026 collection services budget can be reviewed?”

**Answer:** The 2026 budget has not yet been approved by council. Consideration for budget purposes will be driven by the results of the RFP.

The Municipality will not include details of its existing collection services contract.

**Q17.** The Municipality was asked “Has the Municipality levied liquidated damages against the current or any previous collection service provider? If so, can the Municipality please provide high level details, including the frequency and general nature of the infractions (no contractor confidential information required)?”

**Answer:** The Municipality has not levied liquidated damages against it’s current or previous providers.

**Q18.** The Municipality was asked “Is there an anticipated Award Date?”

**Answer:** The anticipated Award Date is predicted to fall within the timeframe of May 28<sup>th</sup> to June 12<sup>th</sup>.

**Q19.** The Municipality was asked “Is an annually renewable performance and Labour and Material Payment Bond acceptable? And how much is required for the performance bond. Provided the Standard Form indicated in 15.1b?”

---

**Answer:** Should the proponent wish to provide an annually renewable Performance and Labour and Material Payment Bond, the Municipality would require a new bond to be provided two months prior to the current bond's expiration date. This option is not preferred by the Municipality.

**Q20.** The Municipality was asked "Is the Municipality open to other licensed locations for Leaf and Yard waste material to be dropped off, provided that pre-approval is obtained by the Municipality prior to the contract start date?"

**Answer:** The Municipality will consider external sites for Leaf and Yard waste material provided that the Proponent incur all costs associated with transportation disposal.

**Q21.** The Municipality was asked "In the event of a statutory holiday, would the Municipality be open to collections taking place on the next workday and/or adopting a push week collection schedule, ie. collections pushed to the next day for the full week?"

**Answer:** The Municipality would not consider collection into the following week in the event of a statutory holiday. It would consider continuing collection into the next day during the week of the holiday, including Saturdays. The proponent shall provide a list of statutory holidays that it will propose alternative collection days for.

**Q22.** The Municipality was asked "With regard to the Contractor's base of operation, is it acceptable that the Contractor maintain offices outside of the immediate municipality provided that it operates within the normal business hours set out by the Municipality?"

**Answer:** The Municipality considers this acceptable.

**Q23.** The Municipality was asked "What exactly does "processing" mean within the context of Leaf and Yard Waste Materials? Does the Municipality expect the Contractor to provide additional services beyond the collection and disposal of said yard waste at a licenced and approved facility?"

---

**Answer:** The Municipality does not require the Proponent to provide additional services beyond the collection and disposal of Leaf and Yard Waste.

**Q24.** The Municipality was asked “What exactly constitutes “processing” as related to the disposal and processing of Bulky Item garbage?”

**Answer:** Processing, as it pertains to the proposed disposal and processing facility for Bulky Item garbage, would mean recycling of the material. The Municipality would consider a disposal and or recycling facility acceptable for such materials.

**Q25.** The Municipality was asked “Would the Municipality consider a fuel escalator?”

**Answer:** The Municipality would consider fuel cost increases to be covered by the CPI.

**Q26.** The Municipality was asked “Will the Municipality take on the agreement with the processing and disposal sites, rather than the contractor?”

**Answer:** The agreement for processing and disposal sites shall be taken on by the Proponent. At this time, the Municipality is not considering an alternative.

**Q27.** The Municipality was asked “Would the Municipality of West Elgin consider retaining responsibility for disposal and processing options, rather than transferring this responsibility to the service provider?”

**Answer:** The Municipality is not considering retaining responsibility for such options at this time.

**Q28.** The Municipality was asked “Is the West Elgin Landfill the disposal location for Leaf and Yard waste materials?”

**Answer:** The Leaf and Yard waste processing location within West Elgin is not the landfill.

---

## **Addendum #1 – Provisional Items**

### **Provisional Item: Toter Carts**

#### **Question and Answer Summary – Clarification**

**Q29.** The Municipality was asked “Would the Municipality consider expanding the use of toter carts to rural areas?”

**Answer:** The Municipality will add rural properties to the toter cart service area upon the request of residents living within those areas.

**Q30.** The Municipality was asked “If the Municipality transitions to an automated collection model, will residents be provided with multiple toters to accommodate the equivalent weekly volume of the four and six bag limits.”

**Answer:** The Municipality is currently considering providing one 360L (95 GAL) tote to each eligible household.

**Q31.** The Municipality was asked “The RFP allows for the possible introduction of Toter Cart service with prior notification and authorization from the Municipality. How likely is this initiative to be implemented through the lifetime of the upcoming contract? If the initiative is launched towards the end of the 7-year contract or the extension period, would the Contractor reserve the right to amend unit pricing provided for supply delivery, and maintenance to reflect current pricing initiatives?”

**Answer:** Should this provisional item be accepted, the intention is that it begin as soon as the Proponent can supply carts to residents. The Municipality does not foresee the described scenario as a possibility.

---

## **Provisional Item: ICI Recycling**

### **Question and Answer Summary – Clarification**

**Q32.** The Municipality was asked “Is it the responsibility of the ICI business to sort the recycling into two streams?”

**Answer:** The individual ICI properties shall be responsible for sorting their recycling into the two streams specified in the RFP. Please note that this pertains to a conditional provisional item.

**Q33.** The Municipality was asked “Will the ICI collection be changed to tote collection in the future?”

**Answer:** It is not foreseen by The Municipality at this time that ICI collection will be changed to tote collection in the future.

**Q34.** The Municipality was asked “Is it the Municipality’s expectation that commercial recycling collection for Rodney and West Lorne be provided as a dedicated load?”

**Answer:** Yes, in accordance with the recently changed Blue Box legislation, ICI recycling collection for Rodney and West Lorne must be a dedicated load kept separate from any residential blue box collection.

**Q35.** The Municipality was asked “Can the Municipality provide an address list of the ICI recycling locations so proponents may conduct site visits and accurately allocate resources?”

**Answer:** Please see the addition of Appendix D, included in this addendum for the map of the locations that will be serviced under the ICI recycling collection program.

**Q36.** The Municipality was asked “Section 8.5 specifies that recycling is to be processed at the City of London recycling facility. Would the Municipality allow proponents to propose an alternative recycling processing facility?”

---

**Answer:**

The Municipality will consider an alternative recycling facility so long as it accepts all the materials as outlined in Appendix B of the RFP.

**Q37.** The Municipality was asked “Regarding ICI collection, would the Municipality object to the collection of the two separate streams from Rodney and West Lorne via a single stream collection unit over two days? I.e. fibre collection from Rodney and West Lorne on one day, and container collection on a separate day?”

**Answer:** The Municipality would not consider this as an option at this time.

**Q38.** The Municipality was asked “Relating to the provisional ICI collection services item, is the Municipality able to share actual ICI recycling contamination experiences so that we have a reasonable frame of reference as to generator compliance with contamination thresholds as referenced within the RFP?”

**Answer:** As of this time, the Municipality does not have a concrete example to provide regarding contamination between ICI recycling and residential blue box recycling. It is expected that the collection of recycling for ICI properties in Rodney and West Lorne be its own dedicated loads kept separate from residential blue box waste. Please consult the necessary regulations regarding the producer responsibility framework in Ontario.

**Q39.** The Municipality was asked “In reference to page 27 and page 29 of the RFP, is the contamination limit for recyclables 5% or 50%?”

**Answer:** The 50% limit refers to the cut-off point for acceptable individual set outs, while the 5% limit refers to the limit of two-stream contamination within the entire load of the truck. Due to the limited number of stops within this provisional item, the Proponent may reject individual set outs below the 50% two-stream contamination threshold should they compromise the contamination limits of the full load.