

TO: All Proponents

FROM: City of Langford

DATE: August 28, 2026

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

ADDENDUM NO: 3

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.

3 INSTRUCTIONS

1. Questions and Responses

Q1. Regarding Section 5.7 Implementation Schedule. The NRFP states that "the Municipalities will not mandate an immediate, simultaneous city-wide launch. Instead, the Contractor must propose and execute a phased, zone by zone implementation plan." Can the City please confirm whether Proponents are permitted to propose an implementation for all zones in one (1) week? Launching a new program for all zones simplifies resident education and can lead to efficiencies for the Contractor.

A1. Yes, under Section 4.6 of the NRFP, proponents are permitted to propose an alternative implementation schedule and include detailed Optional Pricing. In accordance with Section 5.7 of the NRFP, the baseline bid must adhere to a phased, zone-by-zone rollout.

Q2. It is acknowledged that Proponents are to provide pricing for bi-weekly collection services, and alternative pricing for upgraded weekly collection services for both Garbage and Organics. Can the City clarify whether it will decide on one frequency for all Eligible Locations? Or will residents have the option to select weekly or bi-weekly services?

A2. Individual residents will not have the option to select their own collection frequency. The decision regarding collection frequency (bi-weekly vs. upgraded weekly collection) will be decided municipality-wide by each respective City Council (Langford and Colwood).

Q3. Given the continued uncertainty regarding the United States' plan to levy tariffs on Canada, it is requested that the City clarify how Proponents should account for potential tariffs in their pricing submissions, knowing they may cause significant changes to cost structures. For example, the City could add a clause that states that any changes in pricing due to tariffs or change in law at the time of contract award will be demonstrated in writing by the successful Proponent.

A3. Proponents must base their Schedule of Prices on all tariffs, taxes, duties, and applicable legislation in effect as of the Closing Date and are encouraged to procure capital assets from Canadian sources or other countries not subject to applicable tariffs. Proponents shall clearly identify the proposed source country for material capital assets, including Collection Vehicles and Carts, and any known or reasonably foreseeable tariff or other price risk associated with that source. This information shall assist the Evaluation Committee in fairly and accurately considering the price certainty and potential cost risk associated with each Proposal.

The City will additionally incorporate a 'Changes in Taxes and Duties' clause into the final Contract. This clause shall stipulate that following the Closing Date, if any new tariff, tax, duty, or change to an existing tariff, tax, or duty is imposed by any governmental authority that directly and materially increases the cost of goods, materials, or capital assets by an amount greater than 5% of the original contract price that the contractor may make a written request to the City for an equitable adjustment to the contract price and which shall be supported by detailed documentation demonstrating the direct cost impact. The City may request additional documentation to verify the cost impact.

Following the City's review of the contractor's request, the parties shall negotiate in good faith to consider a fair price adjustment not to exceed a maximum percentage of the original contract price, the substitution of goods or materials, or alternative sourcing arrangements, with the goal of minimizing disruptions and maintaining the continuity of the Curbside Waste Collection Program.

Q4. Section 5.2 d) states that the Contractor "must accommodate an opt-in provision for larger multi-unit bare-land or townhouse type residential strata complexes that are interested and suited to join the Program. These larger stratas will be permitted to opt into the Joint Municipal Service Delivery on a case-by-case basis as approved by the Municipalities." Can the City confirm that this section means that larger stratas from both the City of Langford and the City of Colwood will be eligible?

A4. Yes, strata complexes with more than six units located in both Municipalities are eligible to apply. These larger complexes are not automatically serviced under the baseline program; however, they may opt-in as per Section 5.2 d) of the NRFP. Approval of opt-in requests is at the sole discretion of each respective Municipality for properties within its boundaries. Municipal staff will collaborate with the Contractor to conduct physical site assessments to confirm collection eligibility.

Approval will be contingent the collection eligibility of the property to accommodate automated collection with sufficient space for on-site storage and staging of carts in an accessible area, as well as adequate roadside or private roadway access for collection vehicles and safe collection of carts.

Q5. Under Appendix E - Colwood Eligible Location Addresses and Projected Stop Counts, the table separates addresses between residential, small strata, and large strata locations. Can the City provide the same information for Langford?

A5. Please, see below numbers for residential and small stratas only in Langford:

Langford Neighbourhoods	Residential	Small Strata
Bear Mountain	1281	76
City Centre	815	258
Goldstream Meadows	659	73
Langford Lake and Glen Lake	857	226
Mill Hill	1206	222
North Langford	883	96
South Langford	2908	192
Thetis & Millstream	860	197
Westhills	863	117
TOTAL	10332	1457

Q6. Regarding Section 13.2.9 Non-Conforming Locations and Accommodations. The NRFP asks Proponents to "describe how seniors or persons in need of assistance with moving Carts to the road edge could apply for an accommodation and how that could be incorporated into a Contract." To ensure resident privacy, service providers should not have access to the reason a resident receives an accommodation. Given that maintenance of resident privacy is essential, can the City confirm that the Contractor will direct accommodation requests to the City for review and subsequent approval or denial? The Contractor would then only be responsible for providing accommodations to Eligible Locations that have been approved.

A6: No, the Municipalities will not receive or manage curbside accommodation requests directly from residents. Proponents are expected to propose a secure, privacy-compliant methodology within their technical submission detailing how their organization will manage the complete intake, verification, and operational execution of these accommodations. Proponents should outline how their proposed Customer Registration Portal and customer service centre will securely handle any sensitive resident information in accordance with applicable privacy laws.

The Contractor will be expected to maintain confidentiality of all resident data throughout the contract term. The Municipalities will collaborate with the successful Contractor to review and approve their finalized intake and verification methodology, and reserve the right to audit the Contractor's records from time to time to confirm ongoing service and privacy compliance.

Q7. Can the City please confirm whether the following items identified under Section 13 Proposal Submission Requirements count towards the 45-page limit? Or can these items be included as appendices that do not count towards the page limit? Given that some of these items may be several pages and therefore take up a disproportionate amount of space, it would be appreciated if they could be provided as appendices. The specific items are:

- a. **13.1.3 Verifiable documentation proving capacity to secure and maintain all mandatory... licenses, permits, and operational certifications**
- b. **13.1.3 National Safety Code (NSC) Safety Certificate**
- c. **13.2.6 Detailed schedule utilizing a Gantt chart or similar format to track start-up milestones**
- d. **13.2.7 Conceptual draft collection schedule**
- e. **13.2.11 Example Public Education materials and public communications or instructions to customers**

A7. Any attachments to the Proposal, such as the specific items listed in the question above, may be included as appendices that do not count toward the page limit. If any description or explanation is required in relation to the attachments, that should be included in the body of the Proposal and reference the specific appendix.

Q8: Section 5.6 B Statutory Holiday Operations: To allow consistent collection cycles and avoid multi-day route compression following holidays, would the municipality permit proponents to maintain standard operations on statutory holidays, excluding only Christmas Day and New Year's Day?

A8: No. In accordance with Section 5.6 of the NRFP, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Remembrance Day, and Truth and Reconciliation Day are designated as absolute non-collection days on which no curbside collection Work may be executed.

Q9: 3.21 Insurance Clarification Request — 3.21: To ensure proponents can fully comply with the required terms within the five (5) Working Day timeline, could the City please specify the insurance coverage required (e.g., Commercial General Liability, Automobile Liability, Environmental/Pollution Liability) along with the minimum required coverage limits and any mandatory policy endorsements?

A9: Specific insurance requirements are to be determined between the Municipalities and the preferred Proponent(s) as part of potential Contract negotiations. The "five (5) Working Days" timeline begins "at the reasonable request of the City", which would likely be after the insurance requirements have been agreed upon and prior to Contract execution.

Q10: Section 6.4C How will the Municipality compensate the proponent for delinquent customers? Specifically, will the Municipalities reimburse the Contractor directly upon receipt/approval of the report, or only after the tax collection cycle is complete?

A10: The NRFP does not prescribe a timeline or payment trigger for these remittances. In accordance with Section 6.4(d), the Municipalities and the successful Contractor will establish a formal reconciliation and remittance schedule prior to the start of the Operations Period to define how and when outstanding balances are reconciled and paid.

Q11: Section 5.4A-D Outlines two annual community-wide Bulk Waste sweep days with a 3-item limit per home, funded as an optional add-on in the Schedule of Prices. Could the Municipalities confirm whether the cost for these bi-annual sweep events is meant to be priced as a lump-sum/per-household fee to the Municipalities, or if contractors are expected to bill individual homeowners directly via a flat-rate price sheet per item?

A11: The cost for the bi-annual community-wide Bulk Waste sweep events must be priced as an annual per-household (per Eligible Location) surcharge added to the baseline service rate (e.g., A1 + \$, A2 + \$, A3 + \$) within Appendix A (Sample Schedule of Prices Table).

In alignment with the Turnkey Service model defined in Section 4.1(d) and Section 4.4(b), the Contractor is responsible for administering all customer billing. Therefore, if the Municipalities elect to include the Bulk Waste sweeps, this approved annual surcharge will be applied universally to all curbside invoices. The surcharge will be billed to every Eligible Location, regardless of whether an individual household utilizes the service during the sweep events.