



## Department of Solid Waste

61050 SE 27<sup>th</sup> Street • Bend, Oregon 97702

(541) 317-3163

FAX (541) 317-3959

### RFP Document # 2025-328, MRF, Composting, and C&D Consultant Services

#### Response to Submitted Questions

1. RFP states the following on P. 3 of 26: “The purpose of this Request for Proposal (RFP) is to execute a contract with one (1) agency, team, or individual who is qualified to provide assistance with the physical and operational design phases of new municipal transfer station (TF), materials recovery facility (MRF), composting, and construction and demolition (C&D) waste processing in Deschutes County, Oregon.” The above highlighted text states a “new municipal transfer station” however, there is no mention of a transfer station in the scope of services. Please advise if the development of a new transfer station is in the scope and if so, please provide more direction.
  - a. During the term of this contract, the Solid Waste department will be examining the potential redesign of the current Knott Landfill Transfer Station in regards to how it integrates into or alongside a new C&D processing facility and CRPF/MRF. With the upcoming closure of Knott Landfill and the redirection of route trucks into the current transfer station, instead of the landfill working face. With the potential development of a new landfill elsewhere in the County, the current transfer station is not adequately sized to meet the transfer needs of the waste volume generated in the greater Bend area, unless other portions of the waste-stream are diverted into other facilities. How those facilities interface will be within the scope of this contract.

Additionally, it is possible that a new transfer station building may be developed at the new Deschutes County Southwest Transfer Station during the contracting period. This project would be led by the County’s Facilities Department; however, the contracted entity may be asked to provide subject matter expertise on material and traffic flows that would inform design criteria.
2. RFP states on P. 3 of 26 “The term of the resulting contract(s) is estimated to begin on or about July 1, 2025, and terminate on June 30, 2028, with a possible extension of up to two years, subject to County approval.” Can the County provide guidance on how billing rates could be adjusted over this multi-year period?
  - a. The submittals should provide the proposer’s approach to rate adjustments over the term that the County may consider (i.e., CPI, yearly adjusted rate sheet, fixed rate, etc.), with adjustments to be implemented on July 1st of each year.
3. RFP states on P. 4 of 26 “Assistance in developing facility design to include tip floor space, traffic flow, size and shape, or any other aspects of design that impact or are informed by operations.” Can the County clarify what level of effort is expected in “developing facility design” for the various facility components (e.g., MRF, Composting, C&D, etc.)? Is there an expected percentage completion on the drawings? Depending on the site conditions and completion level, this may require a full suite of architectural and engineering disciplines (e.g., civil, MEP, electrical, etc.).
  - a. The County is not expecting the vendor to provide or produce drawings, but to provide operating criteria that informs the design and site layout, along with the ability to review and



provide feedback on design drawings. The Deschutes County Facilities Department will lead in the site layout and building design processes.

- b. For the facility construction, the review would be for functional alignment and operational assumptions. This would include some review of how the building systems interface and align with the potential and/or proposed operating equipment for the different facilities
    - c. For facility operations, the review would include technical design and specifications for equipment for the processing of various material flows.
4. The RFP evaluation criterion #1 (p. 5 of 26) requests proposers to demonstrate "experience with land use entitlements, environmental and natural resources permitting, and implementation under State of Oregon land use laws and local codes". However, the Scope of Services does not clearly define specific permitting tasks or deliverables. Is the intent that this permitting experience be leveraged to inform the facility planning, comparative economic analysis, and feasibility assessments outlined in the scope?
  - a. Yes.
5. The RFP solicits "consulting services for assistance with the physical and operational design phases" of new facilities (p. 2 of 26), yet requests a cost proposal as part of the submittal. Could the County please clarify whether this solicitation is considered a QBS-exempt professional services contract, or whether design services subject to ORS 279C.110 and QBS requirements are anticipated under this contract?
  - a. This is not an engineering or architectural contract, so QBS requirements are not anticipated.
6. Is the County willing to negotiate contract terms?
  - a. The County will consider contract modifications but reserves the right to accept or reject any and all modifications.
7. Does the County have a target budget range in mind for the work outlined in the RFP?
  - a. The County estimates a budget range of \$200,000–\$300,000 per year of engagement
8. Can the County share targets related to the level of capital investment expectations for the new facilities?
  - a. C&D/MRF (CRPF): \$35 million (building and site work only), no equipment
  - b. Compost facility: \$5–8 million (building and site work only), no equipment
  - c. New transfer station: \$18–20 million



9. Can the County share expectations related to the ratepayer's willingness to pay for the cost of new facilities (potential magnitude of rate increases)?
  - a. No. This will be a decision made by the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC).
10. To assess facility scale, does the County have an estimate of potential future annual transfer station, MRF, composting and C&D tonnages expected?
  - a. MRF/CRPF: 40,000 tons/year
  - b. C&D: 80,000 tons/year
  - c. Composting: 50,000–60,000 tons/year
  - d. Transfer station: 40,000 tons/year
11. Should we assume the new facilities will be co-located at the proposed new landfill location (i.e., Moon Pit Site, or at this and other locations)? More specifically, how many different location options will the vendor evaluate as part of the scope of services?
  - a. The facilities C&D/MRF facility will be at the Knott Landfill property, adjacent to the existing transfer station.
  - b. The compost facility will be at the Knott Landfill property if feasible, with the Negus Transfer Station location as a backup.
  - c. There will potentially be a new transfer station in the city of La Pine.
12. Will land siting/purchase be a part of the financial consideration?
  - a. No.
13. In assessing rate impacts of the new facility investments, is it correct to assume that there will be a mix of mandatory collection services (e.g., within City limits) and non-mandatory collection services (e.g., in unincorporated areas) with varying refuse, recycling, and organics service subscriptions levels?
  - a. Yes.
14. Should we assume the selected vendor will need to interact/present outcomes at meetings with the County's Board of Commissioners or other public bodies (i.e. number/types of meetings)?
  - a. Yes, we would expect that the selected vendor would participate in presentation to the Board of County Commissioners at least once a year, as well as to City Councils in the Cities of Bend, Sisters, La Pine, and Redmond as needed.



15. Can the County elaborate on its exact vision of the required deliverables (draft/final reports, RFP template, operating contract)?
  - a. The deliverables include, but are not limited to, the following:
    - i. RFP templates
    - ii. Facility operations criteria to inform building design/construction processes, including draft reviews of design submittals
    - iii. Financial reports with tip fee/service rate impacts of new facilities and operating contracts
    - iv. Assessment of system cost impacts of local CRFP development compared to shipping to existing facility under new RMA funding programs and opportunities
    - v. Facility operating contracts with performance standards
16. The RFP references MRF, composting, and C&D facility types throughout the scope. Can the County clarify if it expects separate feasibility and procurement paths for each stream, or if a single multi-use facility concept is being prioritized?
  - a. The County envisions a separate composting facility and operations from the other materials recovery operations.
  - b. The County is interested in the development of a single building with separate operations for the processing of C&D/bulky waste materials from the processing of commingled recyclable materials collected/governed under the Recycling Modernization Act (RMA). County's current understanding of the new rule-making from the Department of Environmental Quality is that any recyclable materials recovered outside of the recycling depot and residential/commercial/industrial commingled collection system must be processed and baled separately from materials recovered through MSW/C&D processing.
17. Does the County expect this engagement to produce conceptual or preliminary facility design drawings (e.g., site layout, building footprints), or is the design support limited to operational inputs and planning-level recommendations?
  - a. The County is not expecting the vendor to provide or produce drawings, but to provide operating criteria that informs the design and site layout, along with the ability to review and provide feedback on design drawings.
18. Will the County require the consultant team to engage directly with potential third-party operators (e.g., interviews or RFIs), or is the expectation that operator types and criteria will be informed by precedent and consultant expertise?
  - a. The County anticipates that the consultant will engage directly with potential third-party operators along with select County employees throughout the entirety of the procurement process (pre-bid, bidder interviews, proposal evaluation).



19. Under Task 7, the RFP references review of “construction/vendor agreements.” Can the County clarify whether this review is intended to include technical design documents/specs, or if it is limited to reviewing functional alignment with operational assumptions?
  - a. For the facility construction, the review would be for functional alignment and operational assumptions. This would include some review of how the building systems interface and align with the potential and/or proposed operating equipment for the different facilities.
  - b. For facility operations, the review would include technical design and specifications for equipment for the processing of various material flows.
20. For Task 5, does the County anticipate using a single RFP template for all facility types, or should we develop distinct templates for each stream (CRPF, compost, C&D)?
  - a. We will use a single RFP template with modifications based on scope and other considerations.
21. Will the County require any consultant support during the operator or facility procurement period (e.g., pre-bid meeting attendance, bidder Q&A, proposal evaluation), or is this out of scope for this engagement?
  - a. Yes, the consultant/vendor will be participating through the entirety of the procurement process.
22. How does the County intend for this project to align with or support implementation of Oregon’s Recycling Modernization Act (RMA)? Should we assume interaction with PROs or the Oregon DEQ in any capacity?
  - a. Yes, the County anticipates that the consultant will engage with and support its efforts to develop facilities that both support the efforts and the intentions of the RMA, as well as assist in analyzing and identifying the benefits the County can derive from the new opportunities presented by the changes to the recycling system that the RMA can provide. In conjunction with the County the consultant may interact with Circular Action Alliance and the Department of Environmental Quality to identify funding opportunities for facility development along with operational and equipment funding mechanisms.
23. **Note: Interviews are expected to take place on May 16.**