



**ADDENDUM NO. 3**  
**Issued August 17, 2021**

**TO**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR TRANSPORTATION AND DISPOSAL OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE AT REGIONAL FACILITIES (RFP Number 22-OE-001, RFP issued May 14, 2021)**

**And**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR TRANSPORTATION AND DISPOSAL OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE AT OUT OF STATE LANDFILL FACILITIES (RFP Number 22-OE-002, RFP issued May 14, 2021)**

*(Note: This document serves as Addendum 3 to both RFPs listed herein)*

**Note:** Proposers are required to acknowledge this and all Addenda in Section 3 of the Proposal Form.

## **1. RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION**

|    |          |  |
|----|----------|--|
| 1. | Question | MIRA has “requested” that RFP responses to provide two alterative pricing structures around opt in and opt out. Am I correct to assume that this is a request and not mandatory?   |
|    | Answer   | Yes, this is a request. The RFPs contemplate two scenarios; that either the Opt-Out provision in the current Municipal Services Agreements was maintained (default scenario) or that the municipalities may agree to waive that provision and instead opt-in to commit their tons through the end of the term in order to receive favorable pricing. It is not mandatory that a Proposer proposes different pricing structures. If a proposer wishes to propose the same price structure for both scenarios, MIRA requests that they specify that in their proposal. It is also not mandatory that a Proposer submit a proposal for both scenarios. If a proposal is contingent on one of those two scenarios, then MIRA requests that Proposers specify that in their proposal (e.g. this proposal is only valid if municipalities waive their opt-out provision). If a Proposer wishes to propose pricing for each scenario, but the pricing is different if the municipalities waive their opt-out provision than it would be if the municipalities retain their opt-out provision, then MIRA requests that they specify that in their proposal.  |
| 2. | Question | The RFP22-OE-001 and 002 geographical area of opportunity is not clear. 001 indicated NY, RI and MA but then goes on to say that it needs to be in reasonable proximity to the state boarder. Can you confirm the state for 001 and define what reasonable proximity means?  |
|    | Answer   | Proposers who are unsure should use the conjoined proposal form included with Addendum 2. These two RFPs do not contemplate a specific mileage radius. Rather, the difference is contemplated more based on logistics. The Connecticut Solid Waste System was designed as a hub-and-spoke system in which material from the transfer stations has historically been transported to the central hub in Hartford using 100-yard walking floor trailers with regular (not sleeper) cabs. RFP 22-OE-001 contemplates that proposers would provide an alternate disposal “hub” of reasonable proximity that material could be transported via the same transportation logistics (via 100-yard walking floor trailers with “regular”-cab trucks) and either combusted or further transferred (by rail or otherwise). RFP 22-OE-002 contemplated that proposers would provide further-away disposal capacity which might require different transportation logistics (e.g. the use of longer sleeper-cab trucks, or some alternate form of transportation logistics) such that it might require capital improvements at the transfer stations (e.g. paving and curb modifications to accommodate a different turning radius, use of longer truck scales, etc.) or other operational changes (additional waste storage or staging of trailers given that each trailer takes longer to complete a round trip) to accommodate those different transportation logistics. |

**END OF ADDENDUM 3**