



City of Regina



Memo

March 27, 2012

File No.: 5300 APP

To: Deputy City Manager & COO, City Operations

Re: Award of RFP #1959 – Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) Services

Purpose

Environmental Services requests the approval of the Deputy City Manager & COO, City Operations to proceed with the award of Request For Proposals (RFP) 1959 for the Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) Services.

Background

On April 26, 2011 City Council instructed Administration to prepare a RFP for the procurement of co-mingled residential recycling services.

Discussion

The Purchasing Branch closed RFP 1959 – MRF Services on March 1, 2012. Proposal submissions were received from Crown Shred & Recycling and Emterra Environmental.

Proposals were evaluated according to the Evaluation procedure stated in Section F of the RFP and the established evaluation team guidelines (attached as Appendix 1, Waste Plan Regina Evaluation/Scoring Guidelines). In order to proceed to having their Cost of Services submission evaluated, proposals were required to score a minimum of 55 out of 75 technical points. Only Emterra Environmental's proposal met and exceeded the required 55 points and therefore, their Cost of Services submission was opened and evaluated.^{18(1)(c)}

did not meet the required 55 points and therefore, their Cost of Services submission will remain unopened. A copy of the evaluation team's matrix is attached as Appendix 2, RFP #1959 – MRF Evaluation.

Funding

Expenditures from this agreement will start in mid 2013. New funding requirements (expenditures and revenues) will be incorporated in the 2013 budget submission. The program design estimated cost for processing recycling facilities at \$36/household. Using the

same participation and performance criteria, the proposal from Emterra Environmental will be considerably less costly.

Delegated Authority

City Council delegated the authority to approve the award of RFP 1959 to the City Manager or delegated authority.

Recommendation

Solid Waste requests the approval of the Deputy City Manager & COO of City Operations to award an Agreement for RFP 1959 – MRF Services to Emterra Environmental for a term of ten (10) years commencing on July 1, 2013, with an option to extend for two (2) subsequent terms of one (1) year each.

If there are any questions or concerns please contact Derrick Bellows at 777-7649.



Derrick Bellows, P. Eng., FEC, ICD.D
Director, Environmental Services

DB/cp



Attachments: 2

- c: Director of Finance
 - Manager of Solid Waste Collection
 - City Solicitor (Attn: J. Krueger)
 - Financial Services
 - Purchasing Branch
 - Senior Engineer, Solid Waste Collection
 - Senior Business Strategist, Engineering & Business Systems
- 16(1)(a), 16(1)(b), 16(1)(c)

Appendix 1

Waste Plan Regina Evaluation/Scoring Guidelines

The objectives of Request For Proposals (RFP) scoring guidelines are to:

- Ensure consistent and fair scoring to all bidding proponents;
- Remove individual scoring subjectivity; and,
- Achieve a consensus score for each proponents proposal.

Scoring guidelines:

1. Set up an RFP team and an Evaluation Committee.
 - The RFP team should be comprised of members directly or indirectly involved with Waste Plan Regina. Those participants selected to the committee should do most of the work assessing the RFP proposals and its specifications.
 - The Evaluation Committee should be comprised of members directly or indirectly involved with Waste Plan Regina. The committee reviews the proponent's proposals, evaluates, reviews and makes recommendations to appoint a successful candidate.
2. Establish RFP scoring guidelines prior to issuing the RFP's. Then, once the team receives the proposals, they are scored based on the criteria established in the RFP.
3. Determine sufficient time to review each proposal, score, resolve queries, meet/talk to vendors and achieve consensus scores.
4. RFP team members should evaluate and score the proposals individually. Once completed, they should meet to discuss and compare their findings. Agreement on a consensus score is needed for each point and for the proposal/vendor in total. However, initially, there may be a wide variance in scores, comments and queries raised by team members. These will need to be resolved and it may take further investigations/meetings before this can be achieved.
5. Only scores from team members scoring the proposal may be used in any calculations. No one else should be allowed any input at this stage.
6. Individual scoring sheets and summary sheets will assist in the process of awarding and totalling points. Consider recording:
 - preliminary scores (by each team member) for each criteria/proposal;
 - average scores;
 - above or below average scores;
 - vendor totals;
 - variances;
 - weighted scores;
 - agreed consensus scores;
 - analyses of the relative strengths and weaknesses of the proposals;
 - lists of pros/cons/issues/queries (requiring further clarification) for each proposal;
 - graphing the score results; and,
 - recommendations (with reasons).

7. The evaluation team members should completely review and evaluate all proposals and their contents. They should all contribute to the final consensus scores for each vendor's proposal.
8. When working towards achieving consensus scores, team members should be willing to compromise and adjust their preliminary scores if there are compelling reasons.
9. All team members should attend progress review/evaluation meetings as required.
10. Written minutes should be taken in all meetings.
11. Team members **will not** be allowed to communicate directly or in private with vendors or other interested parties until the evaluation process has ended.
15. Once the queries have been resolved and items clarified, then the consensus scores, findings and results should be reviewed by the participating members. They should report/present these details to the other members for their input, discussion and agreement.

MRF RFP Evaluation Team

16(1)(a), 16(1)(b), 16(1)(c)

Collection RFP Evaluation Team

16(1)(a), 16(1)(b), 16(1)(c)

N 2 Evaluation

Criteria	Weighting
Completed and signed Proposal Submission Form	Pass or Fail
(A) Technical Feasibility and Reliability	30 %
16(1)(a)(b) & (c)	16(1)(a) (b) & (c)
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
(B) MRF Location, Transfer Station Location, Innovation and Economic Benefit to the City	6%
16(1)(a)(b) & (c)	16(1) (a)(b) & (c)
_____	_____
_____	_____
(C) Management Plan and Capabilities	31 %
16(1)(a)(b) & (c)	16(1)(a) (b) & (c)
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
(D) Social and Environmental Considerations	8 %
16(1)(a)(b) & (c)	16(1) (a)(b) & (c)
_____	_____
_____	_____
Total Technical	75%
(E) Cost	25 %
Total Score	100 %

Relates to a different contract and was appended in error.

Non-responsive