

Recycling and Solid Waste Committee

Tuesday, March 13, 2012 meeting Minutes

Meeting location: Shutesbury Town Hall, Seniors Lounge

Attendance: Present: Gary Bernhard, Nancy Dihlmann, Gail Fleischaker, Meryl Mandell, Steve Rice, Paul Vlach, Michael Baines at 7:50pm Absent: Karen Czerwonka, Ron Essig. Town Administrator Becky Torres joined us at 8:05 PM
Guest: Arlene Miller, DEP

Minutes taker: Paul

Convened at 7:10 PM to review, consider and rank the contract documents received in response to the Request For Proposals (RFP) for the collection and hauling of Shutesbury trash and recycling.

Technical proposals had been received by Becky prior to this meeting, and RSWC members had obtained copies from her to review in preparation for this discussion. Price proposals were received in separate packets from each, and were not opened or considered until after the group had ranked the technical proposals during this meeting.

Bids were received and considered from the following companies:

Allied Waste Services of Massachusetts, LLC of 845 Burnett Road, Chicopee MA 01020

Duseau Trucking, LLC of P.O. Box 14, Hatfield MA 01038

Amherst Trucking Inc. of P. O. Box 39, North Hatfield MA 01066-0039

Alternative Recycling Systems, LLC of P. O. Box 120, Northampton MA 01061

A discussion ensued over the pros and cons, and relative merits of each technical proposal for the delivery of services under the RFP. Various gaps or omissions were noted for each, of varying degrees; and the strengths and confidence factors that members identified were discussed and weighed.

Paul provided a typed summary of his evaluation to group members, and others shared their thoughts verbally from memory or personal notes. Member Ron Essig had submitted his thoughts in writing, as he was traveling out of town and unable to attend.

This was Ron's input:

One other clarification in my thinking that came up in a conversation with Becky this afternoon when I returned my proposal copies. I rated all the haulers as technically satisfactory. If we had a bid from someone who has a pickup truck and thinks they can pull this off, their proposal would likely be technically unsatisfactory and I would have given them ratings of 1 or 2. Whereas I think that all the bidders have the experience, the equipment, and manpower to successfully do the job. This is the context for my ratings of 3 or better. Thanks for hearing me out. Have fun tomorrow!

Ron

General

I considered a score of 3 or better to be satisfactory and didn't rate anyone below 3. So I believe that all proposals meet the minimum technical specifications. Our award will come down to price, so I strongly recommend that price be weighted at least equal to technical merit, not 25 percent of the four criteria.

Allied Waste Services Experience=5, Completeness=5, Customer Satisfaction=5
As expected from a large corporation, their proposal was far more comprehensive than the others. I like the access to backup trucks, emphasis on safety, recommendations from other towns, and resolution of problems by the next day. The Recyclebank program is intriguing, but there didn't seem to be any recommendation on how it could work in Shutesbury. Clearly, price is likely to be an obstacle in this bidder getting the contract.

Alternative Recycling Systems Experience=4, Completeness=3, Customer Satisfaction=3
This was a very brief, but adequate, proposal. I liked the availability of backup trucks. There doesn't seem to be any proactive communication suggested other than rejection stickers. This is a major drawback.

Amherst Trucking Experience=3, Completeness=3, Customer Satisfaction=3
I was disappointed in the brevity of this proposal based on Mr Pitts' knowledge during his visit, but I thought it was satisfactory. All other bidders listed at least one municipal contract. No mention of a backup truck if two will be used in Shutesbury. A monthly report to the town is good, but how will immediate problems be solved?

Duseau Trucking Experience=4, Completeness=4, Customer Satisfaction=4

Without knowing their prior experience, theirs was a fairly decent proposal and that is reflected in my scoring. But I think the Committee should consider their past problems in its decision. It is good to see that new trucks are on the way, but will be old ones be backups? I like the idea of calling the office prior to leaving town.

This was Paul's written review provided to the group:

Paul Vlach

General commentary:

General Specifications 1.4 states that if no alternatives are specified, the proposer guarantees curbside pickup for each household. Only Alternative Recycling Systems addresses this point, indicating a smaller truck to feed the larger vehicle. I expect any other bidder would look to identify multiple "end of road" pickup points for residents, such as Duseau currently does, so their larger trucks can do the whole route.

None provided a map as referenced in the RFP or anything that would require residents to bring their items to a group collection point.

Apparently none provided electronic copies of their proposals as required, as Becky said she did not have them in that form.

Pricing should be weighed appropriately in comparison to the trust we can have in their ability to deliver consistent quality service, with good communication. We have long been able to provide one of the few town services at the best cost-per-household of any department, and we must not lose sight of that goal.

Allied Waste Services Experience=5, Completeness=5, Customer Satisfaction=5

Allied Waste clearly has the most comprehensive proposal, with the most experience and ongoing history in municipal contracts. They have an extensive backup fleet, comprehensive driver training and a clear focus on safety. Although not stated in their proposal, they referenced a well established system of communication with their clients and customers, and I believe we can have full faith in the provision of accurate weights and volumes. They did provide specific route info as requested, though they did not address pickup on smaller roads, which would not be safely completed with a full size truck.

Alternative Recycling Systems

Experience=4, Completeness=4, Customer Satisfaction=4

This was a more brief, but adequate, proposal. They did list a good backup fleet, and they alone specified their strategy for pickup at each household on all roads, using a small feeder truck to supplement the larger primary one. The rep at the pre-bid meeting

clearly had a grasp of the town volume and road limitations, and I think they will provide reliable and flexible service. Their mid-range company size may very well give us the best of both needs, personal and reliable service, with a reasonable budget. Their proposal is limited in the 'communications' description, but my sense is that they would be compliant once they have a better understanding of our needs, and I have faith they would provide accurate weights and volumes.

Amherst Trucking Experience=3, Completeness=3, Customer Satisfaction=4

The proposal was brief and lacking in details, which the owner clearly knew were of interest and concern to us, during the pre-bid meetings. The plan for service was disappointing, though I think the owner has a clear sense of what needs doing, and how to accomplish it. His stated commitment to open and honest communication, given verbally, was not expressed in the written bid. No backup vehicles were listed, no municipal contracts were listed, and the "monthly reports to the Town Administrator" when the RFP calls for weekly, all raised a concern. I do think we could expect accurate weights and volumes.

Duseau Trucking Experience=4, Completeness=3, Customer Satisfaction=3

The proposal's listing of only one other municipal contract raises concerns, as I recall them having several in the past.

They indicate no financial interest in other companies, yet the proposal makes repeated reference to Valley Recycling and offers rates and services that this "other" Duseau entity could provide.

They make no provisions for small road pickups at each household, yet they indicate they are purchasing more large trucks to service the route. I expect they would plan on the current requirement that residents use common neighborhood collection points.

They gave no info on BWD pricing, which is consistent with their past practice. I can have no faith in compliance with weighing and reporting any loads.

After discussion of the technical proposals, a ranking of the bidders was compiled. Six members rated Allied Waste as their first choice - Gary, Nancy, Gail, Meryl, Steve and Paul. (Michael abstained from voting, as he had not been able to review the packets.)

For second place, there were three votes for Alternative Recycling and two for Duseau Trucking. (Reflecting a tie vote for first by Nancy for Allied and Duseau).

The third place choices were 4 for Amherst Trucking, and one each for Duseau and Alternative Recycling.

Rated as the fourth place choice, there were 3 votes for Duseau; 2 for Amherst Trucking and 1 for Alternative Recycling.

Paul sought clarification from Becky on the relative roles of the RSWC and her, as far as completing the contract award. Becky said she would be 'accepting the input and guidance of the RSWC before finalizing a contract.

The price proposals were opened after the technical rankings had been completed.

The RFP called for 5 years of pricing. In summary here, the first year, last year, and contract term totals are listed. Each collection bid rose in price between years 1-2; 2-3; 3-4 and 4-5.

Company	Year 1	Year 5	Total 5 year cost
Allied Waste	\$53,550	60,271	\$284,305
Alternative Recycling	\$59,500	64,200	\$309,100
Duseau Trucking	\$68,500	74,500	\$357,500
Amherst Trucking	\$83,740	90,642	\$435,785

This is a summary of their rolloff unit pricing:

Allied Waste	\$225 each, all years
Alternative Recycling	\$290 - 30 yard; \$315 - 40 yard, all years
Duseau Trucking	\$155/160/165/170/175
Amherst Trucking	\$250 first year rising to \$280 in the fifth year

It was pleasantly noted that the highest rated bidder was also the lowest priced, and there was a unanimous vote to only begin clarifications of bid, and preliminary negotiation, with Allied Waste. All members voted unanimously to only have a subcommittee of Gary, Paul and Meryl team up with Becky and Arlene to meet with Allied the following week, during the afternoon, pending a successful meeting date agreement by Becky with Allied reps. (Tentatively this was expected to be Tuesday March 20th)

The group listed a tentative list of topics to clarify, based on their proposals, and the specific concerns and needs of the town. Further issues which came to mind were to be referred to Gary in the next several days, so he could draft a final list before the anticipated meeting.

The group was reminded by Arlene that this deliberation, any choices made, and the positive and negative perceptions of all bidders is private info, not to be shared until after the contract award is announced by the town.

At 9:00 pm, the contract bid discussions closed.

Gary then presented a sample "New Wave" trash bag to consider for the next bulk order. This was a product sample sent by Jeff Marcotte of Boxes and Bags Unlimited of Maine. These are priced at \$46.64 per case of 200 (twenty ten-packs per case), versus the \$46.48 case price for the last style of 'drawstring' bags, which had notable problems with failed side seams, and tearing out of the drawstring sleeves. The new style has a single bottom seam (ie: a 'tubular' style bag) with 4 extended 'wings' to cross-tie the top closed.

Arlene presented a sample bag of the same 'tubular, single seam' style bag which is newly offered by a former vendor to the town, Paul Bitters of the Greenfield Bag Co. The group was unanimous in switching to the tubular bags, either with the Maine based company; or the prior vendor, if Becky can get a competitive quote from him in the next few days. Becky said she needs to order 100 cases by Friday of this week - March 16, 2012.

3 - Michael took inventory of the remaining supply in the Seniors Lounge, our assigned storage area, which totaled 82 cases.

- Next meeting date: A subcommittee of Gary, Meryl and Paul, along with Becky and Arlene, will meet with representatives of bidder(s) discussed above to clarify contract issues, as arranged by Becky at a date and time to be determined.

- Next meeting date for the entire committee: None set.

Adjourned: approximately 9:20 pm

These Minutes were approved by the RSWC at the April 10, 2012 meeting. PAV