

TO: All Proponents

FROM: City of Langford

DATE: August 11, 2026

PROJECT: NRFP-2026-0216 Residential Curbside Waste Collection Program

ADDENDUM NO: 01

1 PRECEDENCE

This addendum shall form an integral part of the Work. This Addendum shall take precedence over all requirements of the Negotiated Request for Proposal Documents with which it may prove to be at variance unless otherwise qualified by the City of Langford.

2 PURPOSE

1. This addendum is in response to questions received to date.
2. This addendum provides additional information regarding the question period and closing date of the Negotiated Request for Proposal to the proponents.

3 INSTRUCTIONS

1. Updates to Significant Dates

The City is extending the closing date and time to **Thursday, September 3, 2026 at 2:00 PM PDT**. The deadline for submitting questions is not extended.

2. Questions and Responses

Q1. Anticipated Award Date:

Could the City please confirm or provide an estimated target timeline for the Anticipated Award Date following the closing date of August 27, 2026?

A1. Dependant on the recommendation of the evaluation committee to proceed, the terms of the Contract(s) would then be negotiated with the preferred Proponent(s), and then the final

Contract(s) would be brought forward to Council(s) toward the end of September for authorization.

Q2. Performance Security / Bond Value & Annual Renewal (Section 10.2(c)(ii)):

Section 10.2(c)(ii) of the NRFP document references *"Annual renewals or endorsements of the Performance Security/Bond."* However, the document does not appear to explicitly state a specific dollar (\$) value or percentage (%) required for this Performance Security/Bond.

- Could the City please specify the required dollar value or percentage amount for the Performance Security/Bond?
- Could you also please confirm whether an annually renewable performance bond will be acceptable for the duration of this initial 7-year term?

A2: The Performance Security/Bond will be 10% of the contract value and can be a renewable bond throughout the duration of the initial 7-year term.

Q3. Due to the size, scope, and complexity of this NRFP, we request that a four (4) week extension of the Closing Date be granted. This additional time will allow all Proponents the opportunity to develop more fulsome proposals that deliver value and creativity to the City of Langford and the City of Colwood. Given that this contract commences in late 2027, the additional time will not negatively impact the procurement timeline while providing substantial benefits to all Proponents

A3: The City appreciates the time and effort required to prepare a high-quality response to the NRFP; however, a four-week extension is not feasible. The City will grant a one-time, one-week extension; therefore, the closing date is now extended to September 3, 2026 at 2:00pm PDT.

Q4. Is the program going to be "mandatory" for all homeowners in Langford and Colwood to join? Meaning they cannot have another hauler continue to provide them residential curbside service?

A4: As referenced throughout the NRFP, new Solid Waste Bylaws will be adopted to establish and support this mandatory requirement. Also see section 4.1b).

Q5. Does the house count provided include legal suites? Would legal suites be invoiced to the suite leaser or the owner of the home?

A5: It will be the responsibility of the property owner to select the appropriate size of bin for their occupancy and the waste generation needs of the property. All invoices will be to the property owner, regardless of whether the property includes a legal suite. Therefore, the provided house count does not account for legal suites.

In the NRFP, refer to Section 5.2c). For clarity, properties with secondary suites, whether legal or illegal/unregistered, will be issued only one (1) cart set (one Garbage Cart and one Organics Cart).

Q6. The NRFP notes that the city may direct where the Organics is disposed of, so need to clarify who is responsible for the disposal costs as this location may be charge disposal at a higher rate (due to distance travelled or disposal cost) than where the proponent would go normally.

A6. This cost should be included in Appendix A, Sample Schedule of Prices Table, Price Premiums.

Q7. Some customers may be under agreements directly with a hauler or thru their Strata or Property Management company, are these going to be exempt from the program? If not, who is responsible for any financial issue arising from an agreement being broken?

A7. Property owners under existing agreements with a hauler will not be exempt from the program. These customers will need to provide notice to their existing hauler to terminate the contract prior to the roll-out of the municipally contracted waste service. There should be sufficient time to transition services, therefore, there are no anticipated financial penalties given the roll-out timeline to transition to the municipally contracted service.

Q8. Are there any locations that would be non-accessible by a standard dual axle side load collection truck due to slope, turn radius or the ability to turn around safely.

A8. There may be locations within the service area that are not accessible by certain collection vehicles. In the NRFP, see section 5.1c). It is up to proponents to determine the most appropriate vehicles to complete the collection pending the vehicles meet all requirements outlined in the NRFP.

Q9. With the scope of this project, requiring quotes from a variety of different suppliers (totes, trucks, implementation, IT etc.) and the approvals necessary due to the amount of capital required would it be possible to extend the NRFP submission deadline?

A9. See answer number A3.

Q10. Given fuel cost volatility would there be an allowance to include a fuel surcharge as part of the pricing proposal?

A10. A fuel surcharge could be included in Appendix A, Sample Schedule of Prices Table, Other Prices or Premiums Offered.

Q11. Is there any restriction on the age of the collection vehicles being used in the execution of this program?

A11. There is no restriction on age of collection vehicles; however, proponents should take into consideration the seven-year contract term and ensure the proposed fleet will meet all requirements as stated in the NRFP throughout the duration of the contract.

Q12. Is there any requirement for the collection of the Waste and Organics to be concurrent (the same day)?

A12. It is preferred that waste and organics collection are concurrent; however, proponents can propose alternative collection schedules.

Q13. Would it be possible to get the addresses provided in the NRFP in excel format to help with our analysis? How soon can we get this if possible?

A13. Refer to uploaded excel spreadsheets for Langford and Colwood with Addendum No. 1

Q14. Could the City clarify what is contemplated by the term "Negotiated" within the Negotiated Request for Proposal (NRFP) process for this procurement?

A14. In the NRFP, see sections 3.14 Award, 3.15 Definition of Contract, and 3.16 Right to Negotiate.

Q15. Could the City confirm whether the rates submitted by proponents are expected to be firm for evaluation and award purposes, or whether pricing may be revised through negotiations with the preferred proponent(s) following proposal submission?

A15. Pricing is not considered firm until it is incorporated into an executed Contract. See answer number A14.