

# Durable Compostable Bag Manufacturer RFP – Addendum One



**RAMSEY/WASHINGTON  
RECYCLING & ENERGY**

CONNECTING VALUE TO WASTE

**Issued Date: 3/5/2021**

**Addition(s)/Change(s)/Clarification(s):**

- Change in Solicitation Response Due Date
- Change in Terms and Conditions
- Other

**Please Note the Following Addition(s)/Change(s)/Clarification(s):**

The deadline for proposal submissions has been changed to Tuesday, April 6, 2021.

Event	Estimated Date
Deadline for Proposal Submissions	Tuesday, <del>March 23</del> April 6, 2021 no later than 2:00 p.m.
Contract Negotiations and final award	Anticipated <del>June</del> July 2021

Attachment D was revised March 5, 2021.

Attachment E was revised March 5, 2021.

**Questions and Answers:**

- 1. As several bid details will be clarified in an addendum, it will be a challenge to make 100 custom bags for the bid. Would you consider pushing back the deadline?**

A1. The proposal submission deadline has been changed to April 6, 2021, no later than 2:00 p.m. Central Time.

Please see response to Question 7 for information on producing the custom bags for submittal in response to the RFP.

- 2. Is this solicitation in Beta.Sam, or any other Gov. agency website? Also, will we be able to download both voice and information discussed at the pre-proposal conference?**

A2. This solicitation has been released by the Ramsey/Washington Recycling & Energy Board and is published on the R&E website at [www.recyclingandenergy.org/vendors](http://www.recyclingandenergy.org/vendors).

The video recording of the pre-proposal conference is available online at [www.recyclingandenergy.org/vendors](http://www.recyclingandenergy.org/vendors).

- 3. Can the PowerPoint be shared with participants following the pre-proposal conference?**

A3. The PDF of the presentation slide deck and a video recording of the pre-proposal conference will be available at [www.recyclingandenergy.org/vendors](http://www.recyclingandenergy.org/vendors).

**4. When will RFP addenda be released?**

A4. Please see section 1.12 of the RFP. R&E will attempt to publish periodic addenda on a timely basis. All clarifications and RFP revisions will be documented in an addendum and published to R&E's website at [www.recyclingandenergy.org/vendors](http://www.recyclingandenergy.org/vendors). Questions received less than ten days prior to the date for opening may not be answered.

**5. Can you provide us with the emails of your team who are interested in being cc'd in regard to email communication?**

A5. Please see section 1.9 of the RFP. Questions and inquiries related to this RFP are to be submitted in writing via email and directed to the Point of Contact, Sam Holl, at [sholl@recyclingandenergy.org](mailto:sholl@recyclingandenergy.org). Proposers shall not contact any other R&E staff, Washington and Ramsey County Staff, or R&E Contractors with any questions or inquiries. Unauthorized contact with any personnel of R&E other than the Point of Contact may be cause for rejection of the Proposer's response. The decision to reject a Proposal is solely that of R&E.

**6. Is there a need for any compostable stickers, printed labels or tape?**

A6. Not as a part of this RFP. Please check back at [www.recyclingandenergy.org/vendors](http://www.recyclingandenergy.org/vendors) for future opportunities.

**7. Is the labeling reference actual bag print? If so, is the BPI logo required?**

A7. The available label options must be included in the RFP response, as per Section 4.5. The BPI logo will be required to be on the DCBs as the DCBs must be BPI certified. A label similar to that proposed for R&E DCBs must be on the 100 sample DCBs to be submitted with the RFP response.

**8. You noted labelling distinct from the bag - are you looking for a different color than green altogether, or just a far different shade so it's more visible?**

A8. The respondent's available options for labeling colors should be provided in the proposal, including any up-charges for various colors. The options for labeling must be in a color or shade that is BPI-certified compostable. The proposed printed labelling should be distinct from the shade of the bag itself to ensure it is visible.

**9. Would it be appropriate to make the sample bags without the required labeling? In other words, can the sample bags be the correct size and specifications for the testing purposes?**

A9. Please see response to question 7. A label similar to that proposed for R&E DCBs must be on the 100 sample DCBs to be submitted with the RFP response, as an example of labelling proposed.

**10. How is opacity going to be measured? What is the acceptable opacity tolerance range (as referenced in Attachment B; Section 4.7)?**

A10. DCBs shall have an appropriate level of opacity such that contents cannot be readily seen through the bag. This is to ensure that the contents are not readily visible such that they

interfere with mechanical sorting of DCBs and the visioning system. An acceptable opacity tolerance range has not been set.

A DCB Processing Equipment RFP is currently in process. Once the DCB processing equipment vendor is selected, the selected DCBs will be further tested for ability to sort based on detection rates using the DCB Processing Equipment visioning system.

**11. Do you want the bags to be clear (see-through)?**

A11. No, DCBs shall have an appropriate level of opacity such that contents cannot be readily seen through the bag. Please see response to the previous question.

**12. Do you have specific dimensions of the two proposed bag sizes, the 6-and 13-gallon? I know gallon capacity is defined, but there isn't a straight correlation between size and gallon capacity. Can you provide a sizing range for both sizes?**

A12. The 6-gallon nominal size bag has been updated to 6 to 8-gallon nominal sized bag. The respondent should provide specific dimensions of the bags with a R&E preference for bag dimensions similar to standard garbage bags.

The 6-gallon bags should generally be 20" x 24" and 8-gallon bags should generally be 21" x 23".

13-gallon bags come in a range of sizes, but generally are 24" x 29". Respondents should provide the dimensions of the DCB proposed.

**13. What collection bins will be used? Are there specific bins that are being used for the entire rollout? If so, please provide specs.**

A13. Residents and businesses will use many types and sizes of containers to collect food scraps – R&E does not require certain collection bins at households or businesses prior to placement of organic waste into the DCBs.

**14. When you say the bags are to be sized to be used in commonly used household bins, our experience tells us the most popular household sizes are 3-gallon and 13-gallon. Should those be quoted as opposed to a 6-gallon? This is where there's a divergence between reported gallon capacity and sizing.?**

A14. No, the two DCB sizes should be as specified, 6- to 8-gallon and 13-gallon.

**15. The bid specifies the bags are to be packed 30 bags per roll. Are there other packaging requirements?**

A15. DCBs are to be packed 30 bags per roll by the DCB Manufacturer. The bag distributor in Minnesota will be responsible for further packaging for shipment of the rolls to customers.

**16. We understand the EcoSafe-MultiRes dispenser (as highlighted in Picture 1 in Attachment B; Section 4.8) is sized to accept bags that are made from 0.6 mil film. As per our experience, we will not be able to fit 325 bags per roll with a 1.4 mil thick film as the diameter of the roll would exceed the dimensions of the dispenser. Could you please clarify?**

A16. The requirement for 325 bags per roll for the EcoSafe dispenser has been removed.

Respondents should instead propose the number of 6- to 8-gallon bags per roll that will fit in the dispenser. The dimensions of the current rolls of bags that are used in the dispensers will be provided in the next addendum.

**17. You reference an EcoSafe bag dispenser for the small size bag. Is there a separate dispenser for the 13-gallon bags?**

A17. There will not be a separate dispenser for the 13-gallon bags. Thirteen-gallon bags for distribution at the Ramsey and Washington food scrap drop-off sites should be provided in boxes with a minimum quantity of 200 bags per box.

**18. On attachment E, you are asking for pricing on 6-gallon and 13-gallon bags, should that be 2.5 gallons?**

A18. 2.5-gallon bags are currently distributed at the county food scraps drop off sites, but this size bag is not in scope for this solicitation. After the DCB program launches, 6- to 8-gallon DCBs will be distributed in the EcoSafe bag dispensers. A quote is not requested for 2.5-gallon DCBs.

**19. Out of the total quantity required, what's the size-wise quantity bifurcation?**

A19. A specific split of the DCBs required by size has not been identified by R&E. For purposes of pricing comparison, 75 percent of the DCBs are assumed to be 6-gallon bags and 25 percent of the DCBs are assumed to be 13-gallon bags. This is an RFP, so pricing is one component of the proposal evaluation.

**20. Are both sizes required in rolls of 30? The 13-gal packed 30/roll at 1.4 mil will be a particularly large roll.**

A20. Both the 6-gallon and 13-gallon DCBs will be required to be in rolls of 30.

**21. Can the initial samples be of similar sizes? (Similar to the 6-gal and 13-gal sizes requested)?**

A21. The samples provided should be of the size proposed by the respondent in the RFP.

**22. In the pre-proposal meeting, I saw references to "Tying Methodology," where is that in the RFP? Do you want handles on these like shopping bags?**

A22. Attachment B, Section 1.2, Item 3. describes the preferred tying method. If an alternative tying method is proposed, please describe in your response. The respondent should propose a DCB with a flat top. The RFP allows the respondent to propose alternatives, and a DCB with handles, drawstrings or other closure methods can be proposed.

**23. Attachment B; Section 3.0 Performance Specifications: The test methods are clearly defined, but there are no performance targets. Absent of specific performance targets, how can we ensure a 1.4 mil film will work in the MSW collection and sorting process?**

A23. Selected vendors bags will be performance tested in the field using a set process and procedure that mimic Attachment B, Section 1.2 Generalized Life Cycle of the DCB.

Attachment B, Section 3.3 Tensile Strength, 3.4 Tear Resistance, 3.5 Impact Resistance, 3.6 Burst Strength, 3.7 Dry Load Capacity, and 3.8 Wet Load Capacity are removed from the requirements for submittal. Testing to establish baselines per the ASTM standards

referenced in these sections may be required of vendors after performance testing and prior to execution of a final agreement.

**24. Knowing many compostable films are different in terms of performance, can we propose a lower thickness film made from innovative polymer science?**

A24. The DCBs are an integral part of the program and must perform as specified in the RFP. 1.4 mil is the recommended thickness to ensure DCBs make it through all the steps in the process. Respondent may propose an alternative thinner mil as long as the DCB performs at the same level as a 1.4 mil DCB and passes all performance requirements.

**25. How much will the bid be influenced by performance testing results?**

A25. The DCBs and the performance of the DCB as indicated in Attachment B, Section 1.2 is critical to the R&E DCB program. The RFP award will be strongly influenced by performance testing results and the DCB meeting performance requirements. An initial field performance testing protocol was developed by R&E in fall of 2020, the description and results of which may be found [here](#).

**26. How will the acceptance criteria be measured? Is it relative to other RFP participants?**

A26. Respondents must meet the requirements in Attachment B, Section 3.0 Performance Specifications and Section 4.0 Design Specification. DCBs must perform as specified in the field in order to be considered.

**27. What is the test method for wet load vs dry load (Attachment B; Sections 3.7 and 3.8)?**

A27. Please see response to question 23. The requirements for wet load and dry load testing are removed from the RFP. In lieu of this requirement, a question has been added to the questionnaire requesting maximum quantity of food scraps each DCB will hold.

**28. Shelf life & storage conditions – are manufacturers expected to guarantee shelf life regardless of storage conditions residents keep bags in?**

A28. No. Attachment B, Section 3.2 requests Respondents state the details of any storage or other conditions affecting the “shelf life”. Attachment D under Performance Guarantees allows the Respondents to provide details for appropriate storage.

**29. Will you accept 6- to 12-month shelf life instead of 18-month?**

A29. No. The DCBs must have an 18-month shelf life after manufacture to accommodate time for shipping, distribution to subscribers, and use.

**30. With regard to frequency of delivery of goods, I understand this is a CIF program (as in, all associated costs, being inland, ocean freight, etc., are all put into cost of goods). Is there a schedule as to how much and how often product will be ordered? Will annual quantities have to be shipped to Minnesota once per year or in multiple shipments per year?**

A30. Delivery frequency to the distributor in Minnesota has not yet been identified and may be based in part on the quantity and rate of customer subscriptions. Delivery schedules may be intermittent and/or more frequent as the program ramps up in volume. Respondents should include delivery capabilities in their proposal submission.

**All Addenda are to be acknowledged on the Cover Page to be included with your submission. FAILURE TO DO SO MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF THE SOLICITATION RESPONSE. Unless otherwise specified above, the Solicitation Response due date and time and all other Terms and Conditions remain the same.**