

FINAL REPORT

# Solid Waste Transport and Disposal Services RFQu/RFP Process and Results

*Prepared for*

Metro

November 13, 2018



CH2M Engineers, Inc.  
2020 SW Fourth Avenue Suite 300  
Portland, OR 97201-4973



# CONTENTS

Section	Page
Purpose and Up-Front Planning.....	1
1.1 Purpose .....	1
1.2 Planning and Initial Research.....	1
RFQ/u Process.....	3
Request for Proposal Process .....	4
3.1 Development of Evaluation Criteria and Engagement with Metro Council .....	4
3.2 Draft RFPs.....	4
3.3 Proposal Process.....	4
3.3.1 Proposal Evaluation Methodology.....	5
3.3.2 Proposal Deadlines .....	6
3.3.3 Proposals Received .....	6
3.3.4 Evaluation Committees and Process .....	7
3.4 Proposal Evaluation Results.....	8
3.4.1 Transportation Proposal Point Allocations and Scores.....	8
3.4.2 Disposal Proposal Point Allocations and Scores .....	12
3.4.3 Transportation Proposal Scoring Summary .....	14
3.4.4 Disposal Proposal Scoring Summary.....	14
3.5 Disposal Proposer Interviews .....	16
3.5.1 Interview Process.....	16
3.5.2 Interview Results .....	17
3.6 Final Evaluation Results and Next Steps .....	17

**Tables**

- Table 1. Points Assigned to Criteria
- Table 2. Points for Criteria and Sub-Criteria, Transportation Proposal Evaluation
- Table 3. Scores Assigned by Evaluation Committees to Transportation Proposals to Columbia Ridge Landfill
- Table 4. Scores Assigned by Evaluation Committees to Transportation Proposals to Finley Buttes, Roosevelt Regional, and Wasco County Landfills
- Table 5. Points for Criteria and Sub-Criteria, Disposal Proposal Evaluation
- Table 6. Scores Assigned by Evaluation Committees to Disposal Proposals
- Table 7. Total Scores for Transportation Proposals to Columbia Ridge Landfill
- Table 8. Scores Assigned by Evaluation Committees to Transportation Proposals to Finley Buttes, Roosevelt Regional, and Wasco County Landfills
- Table 9. Total Scores for Disposal Proposals
- Table 10. Scores Assigned by Interview Panelists
- Table 11. Total Scores for Disposal Interviews
- Table 12. Total Scores for Disposal Interviews



# PURPOSE AND UP-FRONT PLANNING

## 1.1 PURPOSE

Currently, Metro contracts for the disposal of garbage (putrescible waste) from the greater Portland area and the transportation of that waste from Metro Central and Metro South transfer stations to the chosen landfill. Those contracts will expire at the end of 2019. In October 2016, Metro began researching various methods for procuring these services for solid waste requiring disposal at its Metro South and Metro Central transfer stations. Ultimately, that research was utilized to select the procurement methodology that was chosen.

This report summarizes the initial research, documents the procurement process, and describes the results of that process.

## 1.2 PLANNING AND INITIAL RESEARCH

Planning for the procurement process began with research into the transportation and disposal options available to Metro. The research addressed questions such as:

- What are the potential landfills available for the disposal of solid waste from Metro’s stations?
- What are the feasible modes of transporting waste to the landfills identified?
- What are the potential combinations of transport and disposal options by transfer station?
- What are the available strategies to ensure competition in procuring transport and disposal services?
- How do different configurations enhance the strengths of the Metro solid waste system?
- Are there future risks or opportunities associated with implementing a particular combination, including financial aspects as well as the barriers to implementation, and how can those risks can be minimized while opportunities are maximized?
- How the configurations under consideration fit with the stated values for the solid waste system which are:
  - protecting people’s health
  - protecting the environment
  - getting good value for the public’s money
  - keeping a commitment to the highest and best use of materials
  - being adaptive and responsive to changing needs and circumstances
  - ensuring adequate and reliable services are available to all types of customers
- What considerations must be made to ensure consistency with Regional Freight System Policies of Metro’s Regional Transportation Plan?
- What are the potential impacts on host communities?
- What are the on-site logistics associated with the delivery of waste to the identified landfills?
- Who are the existing providers of the services being sought?

In addition to this research, tours were conducted of potential service providers' facilities, and an analysis was conducted on a series of potential transportation and disposal scenarios to assess how well different scenarios aligned with Metro's values. A technical memorandum summarizing the results of this research was prepared and submitted to various stakeholders and the Metro Council (Memorandum: Transportation and Disposal Evaluation – Phase 1 Results, May 9, 2017).

Metro staff reviewed this research and then deliberated about the best procurement strategy for selecting its transportation and disposal service providers. It decided to first issue a Request for Qualifications (RFQu) to select landfills that were able meet Metro's requirements and qualify them to offer formal proposals. This enabled transportation proposers to prepare more specific proposals related to the logistics and costs associated with transportation to the different pre-qualified landfills. It also decided to issue separate Requests for Proposal (RFP)s for transport and disposal and to allow proposers to submit proposals to transport waste from one or both of Metro's transfer stations and for landfills to accept waste from one or both transfer stations.

## SECTION 2

# RFQ/u Process

Metro prepared an RFQ that was issued in June 2017. The RFQ required respondents to confirm available capacity and document the current state of landfill gas capture and beneficial use. The RFQ, issued on June 9, 2017, included the following statement to clearly define the intent of the RFQ: “Metro will use the information obtained in this RFQ process to pre-qualify firms for participation in the disposal RFP. **Only those firms that are pre-qualified through this RFQ will be eligible to respond to any subsequent solid waste disposal procurement that may result directly from this RFQ.**”

Responses were provided to Metro on June 29, 2017. After review, Metro found that all landfills that submitted a response to the RFQ met Metro’s stated qualifications. These landfills (and the landfill owner) are as follows:

1. Columbia Ridge Landfill (Waste Management Disposal Services of Oregon, Inc.)
2. Finley Buttes Regional Landfill (Finley-Buttes Limited Partnership, Waste Connections, Inc.)
3. Roosevelt Regional Landfill (Regional Disposal Company, Republic Services, Inc.)
4. Wasco County Landfill (Wasco County Landfill, Inc., Waste Connections, Inc.)<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Wasco County Landfill proposed accepting waste from either of the two Metro transfer stations, but not both.

# REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL PROCESS

Following the RFQu process, Metro staff developed evaluation criteria, engaged with the Metro Council regarding procurement strategy, issued draft RFPs for industry comment, and issued final RFPs.

## 3.1 Development of Evaluation Criteria and Engagement with Metro Council

Metro staff developed draft evaluation criteria to be used for evaluating transportation and disposal proposals. Subsequently, staff engaged the Metro Council at a work session on August 1, 2017, at which it sought comment from councilors about the number of points to be allocated to each Disposal RFP evaluation criterion. Similar feedback was received for the number of points to be allocated to each Transportation RFP evaluation criterion at a Council work session on July 18, 2017.

The evaluation criteria and the points assigned to each criterion in the two RFPs are as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Points Assigned to Criteria

Evaluation Criteria	Points for Each Criterion	
	Transportation	Disposal
Environmental	20	25
Operational Considerations/ Reduction of Risk to Metro	20	15
Community and Diversity	20	25
Cost	40	35
Total	100	100

Specifics about what Metro would consider in its evaluation of each criterion was outlined in each RFP. The specific aspects scored for each criterion are referred to as sub-criteria, and the sub-criteria are described in Section 3.4.

## 3.2 Draft RFPs

Metro released draft Transportation and Disposal RFPs on August 15, 2017 to potential proposers and the public. Metro engaged in conversations with all four Counties' elected commissioners and the Columbia River Gorge Commission. Metro received comments from many residents, and the Metropolitan Alliance for Workforce Equity. Comments were considered and a series of modifications were made in response to Metro's outreach.

## 3.3 Proposal Process

The proposal evaluation methodology, proposal deadlines, proposals received, and proposal evaluation committee and process are discussed in the following sub-sections.

### 3.3.1 Proposal Evaluation Methodology

Metro’s RFPs included an evaluation methodology intended to provide flexibility for the proposers in what they proposed on and to provide good information for Metro to decide about the proposers that best met the evaluation criteria. That evaluation process was summarized in the RFPs as follows.

1. **Select Qualified Proposers for Disposal.** The disposal RFQu would set forth various requirements that a qualified proposer must satisfy such as capacity, landfill gas to energy (LFGTE), community acceptance, and operating hours.

Metro would select and announce the qualified firms from the disposal RFQu. Qualified disposal firms were to be included in proposals associated with the transportation RFP (transportation companies would provide pricing to each qualified landfill they would like to transport to) using the transfer station options that they chose. The transportation RFP has the following options to choose from:

- a. Metro Central Station Only
- b. Metro South Station Only
- c. Both stations

3. **Evaluate Transportation and Disposal Proposals.** The proposals for Transportation and Disposal would be opened and evaluated at the same time. Proposals would be evaluated using the evaluation criteria as discussed in the RFPs.

4. **Calculate Total Transportation System Cost (TTS cost).** The cost component of the transportation and disposal evaluation approach would be based on the TTS cost which would include: A. any added cost at transfer stations above the current baseline; B. transportation cost of highest rated proposer.

5. **Prepare Transportation High-Score Matrix.** Metro would prepare a selection matrix like the following that identified the highest scoring proposer for each station option to each qualified landfill. As shown, the highest scoring proposer could be different for various combinations of station option and landfill.

#### Transportation High-Score Matrix

Station Option	High-Scoring Transportation Proposer			
	To Landfill A	To Landfill B	To Landfill C	To Landfill N
Metro Central Station	Firm x	Firm y	Firm y	Firm x
Metro South Station	Firm y	Firm x	Firm z	Firm x
Both Stations	Firm x	Firm x	Firm x	Firm z

This matrix would be used to identify the proposer whose TTS cost will form the transportation component of the total disposal cost for a landfill.

6. **Prepare High-Score Disposal Matrix.** The highest scoring proposal for the disposal RFP would be identified for the following 3 options:
  - a. Metro Central Station Only
  - b. Metro South Station Only
  - c. Both stations

Note that when scoring each disposal proposal, the cost of each proposal would include both the cost of disposal and the TTS cost for the highest-scoring transportation proposer to that

landfill as identified in the table above. The result would be a disposal high-score matrix as follows.

**Disposal High-Score Matrix**

	<b>High-Scoring Disposal Proposer</b>
<b>Option A: Metro Central Station</b>	Firm a
<b>Option B: Metro South Station</b>	Firm b
<b>Option C: Both Stations</b>	Firm c

7. **Prepare High-Score Transportation and Disposal Combinations.** The preferred transportation and disposal combination would be identified by comparing aggregated scores for three combinations:

1. Fully-Independent Proposals
2. One Transportation Proposal; Two Disposal Proposals
3. Full Aggregation: One Transportation Proposal, One Disposal Proposal

Examples of these combinations follow.

**1. Fully-Independent Proposals: 2, 3, or 4 contracts depending on scoring**

	<b>From Metro Central Station</b>	<b>From Metro South Station</b>
Transportation RFP	Firm x	Firm y
Disposal RFP	Firm a	Firm b

**2. One Transportation Proposal; Two Disposal Proposals: 2 or 3 contracts depending on scoring**

	<b>From Metro Central Station</b>	<b>From Metro South Station</b>
Transportation RFP	Firm x	
Disposal RFP	Firm a	Firm b

**3. Full Aggregation: One Transportation Proposal, One Disposal Proposal; 2 contracts**

	<b>Both Stations</b>
Transportation RFP	Firm x
Disposal RFP	Firm a

The scoring of the combinations is discussed in Section 3.4 below. Metro’s RFP also allowed for an interview process that would include an additional 25 points, as discussed in Section 4.

### 3.3.2 Proposal Deadlines

The Transportation RFP and the Disposal RFP were both issued on October 20, 2017.

Responses were due to Metro no later than January 24, 2018.

### 3.3.3 Proposals Received

For the Disposal RFP, Metro received proposals for the four landfills that submitted on the RFQu, as listed in Section 1.2. For the Transportation RFP, Metro received the following proposals:

1. LTI, Inc. – Truck haul from Metro Central and Metro South stations to all landfills.
2. Tidewater Barge Lines, Inc. – Truck haul from Metro Central Station to the Advanced American Construction barge terminal in Northwest Portland, barge to the Port of Morrow terminal in Boardman, truck to Columbia Ridge Landfill and Finley Buttes Regional Landfill.
3. Walsh Trucking Co., Ltd. – Truck haul from Metro Central and Metro South stations to Columbia Ridge Landfill, Roosevelt Regional Landfill, and Wasco County Landfill.
4. Waste Management Disposal Services of Oregon, Inc. – Truck haul from Metro Central and Metro South stations to the Union Pacific Railroad’s Albina Railyard in Portland, rail to Waste Management’s rail terminal at the Columbia Ridge Landfill, truck to disposal at Columbia Ridge Landfill.

### 3.3.4 Evaluation Committees and Process

Metro assembled the following three evaluation committees that were responsible for scoring proposals against criteria and sub-criteria, and allocating points to sub-criteria.

- Environment and Operations Committee
- Community and Diversity Committee
- Cost Committee

#### Environment and Operations Committee

This committee consisted of three staff from Metro and one from CH2M. The committee was supplemented by technical resources from CH2M, WIH Resources, and Brown and Brown Northwest. These technical resources provided findings to the committee related to the following five aspects of the proposals:

1. WIH Resources: Transportation operations, safety, maintenance and emergency response
2. CH2M: Landfill gas
3. WIH Resources: Landfill contingency plans, safety, emergency procedures, hours and days of operation, and areas of concern or potential risks to Metro.
4. CH2M: Emissions from estimated fuel consumption for the transportation proposals, and estimates of the dollar value of particulate matter (PM), nitrous oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>), and carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) based on federal guidance of the dollar value per emission quantity. Monetized emissions were used to score and allocate points for the combined emissions estimates for sub-criteria 1a, 1b, and 1d (PM, NO<sub>x</sub> in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, and carbon dioxide).
5. Brown and Brown Northwest: The financial strength of each proposer (and reviewed by Metro’s Chief Financial Officer).

Findings from the technical resources were provided to the evaluation committee for its consideration in scoring proposals.

Committee members met in facilitated sessions to conduct two main tasks:

1. Allocate points to sub-criteria for the Operational Considerations and Environmental criteria of the Transportation proposals and the Environmental and Operational Risk criteria of the Disposal proposals.
2. Score each proposal against the criteria for those same criteria.

When allocating points to sub-criteria, each committee member allocated points individually then participated in a group discussion about each member's reasons for the point assignments. Committee members were given an opportunity to revise their point allocations after hearing the rationale other members gave for theirs. After this discussion, the group developed a consensus point allocation for each sub-criterion that established how points for each criterion was allocated to sub-criteria.

When scoring each proposal against the sub-criteria, Committee members each individually reviewed each Transportation and Disposal proposal, and the technical evaluations, and scored each proposal for each sub-criterion (excepting the four Emissions sub-criteria of the Transportation Environmental criteria, which were calculated by CH2M) utilizing the evaluation criteria and requirements as outlined in the RFPs.

The evaluation committee met after completing their individual scoring. They discussed the merits of each proposal and the rationale they gave for each score. Committee members were given an opportunity to revise their scores after hearing the rationale other members gave for their scores and considering information they may have overlooked or misunderstood. If changes were made, the Committee member crossed out their original score, revised the score, and noted the reason for the change. Once this process was complete, the average score from the four committee members was used to score each proposal for each of the sub-criteria.

### **Community and Diversity Committee**

An evaluation committee was formed to evaluate the Community and Diversity aspects of each proposal. The committee consisted of three representatives from community organizations with expertise in diversity, equity and inclusion and one Metro staff member. Scoring of proposals and allocating points to the sub-criteria was conducted as described above for the Environment and Operations Committee.

### **Cost Committee**

The Cost Committee consisted of Metro staff who prepared a cost model that was used to calculate the cost of each proposal in accordance with the cost formulas set forth in the RFP. The cost model was used to assign points for the cost of each proposal for the transportation and disposal proposals. The model calculations and model results were reviewed by CH2M. As described in Section 3.3.1, the cost of the disposal proposals included the Total Transportation System Cost of the high-scoring proposer from each transfer station to each landfill.

## **3.4 Proposal Evaluation Results**

### **3.4.1 Transportation Proposal Point Allocations and Scores**

#### **Point Allocations to Criteria and Sub-Criteria**

The points to criteria specified in each RFP and the results of the evaluation committee's allocation of points to sub-criteria are shown for the Transportation proposal evaluation in Table 2.

#### **Proposal Scores**

The scores assigned by the evaluation committees to the transportation combinations are shown in the tables below; Table 3 (Columbia Ridge Landfill (CRL)) and Table 4 (Finley Buttes (FBL), Roosevelt Regional (RRL), and Wasco County (WCL) landfills).

**Table 2. Points for Criteria and Sub-Criteria, Transportation Proposal Evaluation**

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		<b>Points</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Operational Considerations/Reduction of Risk to Metro</b>	<b>20</b>
1.1	Sufficient equipment and personnel	4.0
1.2	Operational procedures/location-reliable, timely service	3.0
1.3	Contingency plans	2.0
1.4	Equipment maintenance procedures and facilities	2.0
1.5	Equipment replacement schedules	1.0
1.6	Maximize payloads over time (trailer floors)	1.0
1.7	Safety procedures/training/statistics	2.0
1.8	Emergency procedures	2.0
1.9	Flexibility of the system in adapting to future changes	2.0
1.10	Financial strength	0.5
1.11	Sustainable practices proposed	0.5
<b>2</b>	<b>Environmental</b>	<b>20</b>
2.1	Monetized Emissions (PM; NO <sub>x</sub> in Columbia River Gorge Scenic Area; CO <sub>2</sub> )	15.0
2.2	Fuel Use in Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area	3.0
2.3	Noise and traffic effects on neighborhoods	2.0
<b>3</b>	<b>Community and Diversity</b>	<b>20</b>
3.1	Workforce diversity	6.0
3.2	Wages and benefits	6.0
3.3	Subcontractors and suppliers (COBID)	5.0
3.4	Community relations commitment	3.0
<b>4</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>40</b>

Table 3. Scores Assigned by Evaluation Committees to Transportation Proposals to Columbia Ridge Landfill

Evaluation Criteria		LTI - MCS to CRL	TW - MCS to CRL	Walsh - MCS to CRL	WM - MCS to CRL	LTI - MSS to CRL	Walsh - MSS to CRL	WM - MSS to CRL	LTI - Both to CRL	Walsh - Both to CRL	WM - Both to CRL
<b>1</b>	<b>Operational Considerations/Reduction of Risk to Metro</b>										
1.1	Sufficient equipment and personnel	3.6	3.0	4.3	3.5	3.6	4.3	3.5	3.9	4.5	3.5
1.2	Operational procedures/location-reliable, timely service	3.4	3.0	4.3	4.4	3.4	4.3	4.4	3.4	4.5	4.4
1.3	Contingency plans	3.9	2.5	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.0
1.4	Equipment maintenance procedures and facilities	4.5	2.8	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4
1.5	Equipment replacement schedules	4.8	2.9	4.5	4.1	4.8	4.5	4.1	4.8	4.5	4.1
1.6	Maximize payloads over time (trailer floors)	4.5	3.8	4.5	3.8	4.5	4.5	3.8	4.5	4.5	3.8
1.7	Safety procedures/training/statistics	4.8	2.4	4.5	4.3	4.8	4.5	4.3	4.8	4.5	4.3
1.8	Emergency procedures	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
1.9	Flexibility of the system in adapting to future changes	3.9	2.4	3.9	3.5	3.9	3.9	3.5	4.3	4.3	3.9
1.10	Financial strength	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
1.11	Sustainable practices proposed	4.4	3.4	4.0	4.5	4.4	4.0	4.5	4.4	4.0	4.5
<b>2</b>	<b>Environmental</b>										
2.1	Monetized Emissions (PM; NO <sub>x</sub> in Columbia River Gorge Scenic Area; CO <sub>2</sub> )	15.0	0.0	11.5	6.2	15.0	11.5	5.1	15.0	11.5	5.6
2.2	Fuel Use in Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area	0.0	3.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
2.3	Noise and traffic effects on neighborhoods	3.4	4.3	4.3	3.8	3.4	4.3	2.6	3.4	4.3	3.1
<b>3</b>	<b>Community and Diversity</b>										
3.1	Workforce diversity	3.7	2.0	2.7	3.7	3.7	2.7	3.7	3.7	2.7	3.7
3.2	Wages and benefits	5.7	5.8	0.3	4.7	5.7	0.3	4.7	5.7	0.3	4.7
3.3	Subcontractors and suppliers (COBID)	1.7	1.3	0.7	2.7	1.7	0.7	2.7	1.7	0.7	2.7
3.4	Community relations commitment	2.2	2.7	1.7	1.3	2.2	1.7	1.3	2.2	1.7	1.3
<b>4</b>	<b>Cost</b>	11.7	15.0	40.0	29.4	14.1	40.0	27.9	15.0	40.0	31.7
Note: Totals may not add because of rounding.											

Table 4. Scores Assigned by Evaluation Committees to Transportation Proposals to Finley Buttes, Roosevelt Regional, and Wasco County Landfills

Evaluation Criteria		LTI - MCS to FBL	TW - MCS to FBL	LTI - MSS to FBL	LTI - Both to FBL	LTI - MCS to RRL	Walsh - MCS to RRL	LTI - MSS to RRL	Walsh - MSS to RRL	LTI - Both to RRL	Walsh - Both to RRL	LTI - MCS to WCL	Walsh - MCS to WCL	LTI - MSS to WCL	Walsh - MSS to WCL
<b>1</b>	<b>Operational Considerations/Reduction of Risk to Metro</b>														
1.1	Sufficient equipment and personnel	3.6	3.0	3.6	3.9	3.6	4.3	3.6	4.3	3.9	4.5	3.6	4.3	3.6	4.3
1.2	Operational procedures/location-reliable, timely service	3.4	3.0	3.4	3.4	3.4	4.3	3.4	4.3	3.4	4.5	3.4	4.3	3.4	4.3
1.3	Contingency plans	3.9	2.5	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9
1.4	Equipment maintenance procedures and facilities	4.5	2.8	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.3
1.5	Equipment replacement schedules	4.8	2.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.5
1.6	Maximize payloads over time (trailer floors)	4.5	3.8	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
1.7	Safety procedures/training/statistics	4.8	2.4	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.5
1.8	Emergency procedures	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
1.9	Flexibility of the system in adapting to future changes	3.9	2.4	3.9	4.3	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.1	4.3	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9
1.10	Financial strength	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
1.11	Sustainable practices proposed	4.4	3.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.0	4.4	4.0	4.4	4.0	4.4	4.0	4.4	4.0
<b>2</b>	<b>Environmental</b>														
2.1	Monetized Emissions (PM; NO <sub>x</sub> in Columbia River Gorge Scenic Area; CO <sub>2</sub> )	15.0	0.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	12.4	15.0	12.4	15.0	12.4	15.0	11.3	15.0	11.5
2.2	Fuel Use in Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area	0.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.3	3.0	2.3	3.0	2.3	3.0	2.3	3.0	2.3
2.3	Noise and traffic effects on neighborhoods	3.4	4.3	3.4	3.4	3.4	4.3	3.4	4.3	3.4	4.3	3.4	4.3	3.4	4.3
<b>3</b>	<b>Community and Diversity</b>														
3.1	Workforce diversity	3.7	2.0	3.7	3.7	3.7	2.7	3.7	2.7	3.7	2.7	3.7	2.7	3.7	2.7
3.2	Wages and benefits	5.7	5.8	5.7	5.7	5.7	0.3	5.7	0.3	5.7	0.3	5.7	0.3	5.7	0.3
3.3	Subcontractors and suppliers (COBID)	1.7	1.3	1.7	1.7	1.7	0.7	1.7	0.7	1.7	0.7	1.7	0.7	1.7	0.7
3.4	Community relations commitment	2.2	2.7	2.2	2.2	2.2	1.7	2.2	1.7	2.2	1.7	2.2	1.7	2.2	1.7
<b>4</b>	<b>Cost</b>	29.3	40.0	40.0	40.0	22.0	40.0	24.3	40.0	24.8	40.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	40.0
Note: Totals may not add because of rounding.															

## 3.4.2 Disposal Proposal Point Allocations and Scores

### Point Allocations to Criteria and Sub-Criteria

The points assigned to criteria specified in each RFP in Table 5 below.

### Proposal Scores

The scores assigned by the evaluation committees to the disposal combinations are shown in Table 6. The scores are grouped by proposals received to accept solid waste from Metro Central Station (MCS), from Metro South Station (MSS), and from both transfer stations.

Table 5. Points for Criteria and Sub-Criteria, Disposal Proposal Evaluation

Evaluation Criteria		Points
<b>1</b>	<b>Environmental</b>	<b>25</b>
1.1	Landfill gas emissions	9.0
1.2	Landfill beneficial use	7.0
1.3	Permit compliance	6.0
1.4	Sustainable practices proposed	3.0
<b>2</b>	<b>Operational Risk</b>	<b>15</b>
2.1	Transportation interface	5.0
2.2	Contingency plans	2.0
2.3	Safety procedures and performance	2.0
2.4	Emergency procedures	1.0
2.5	Financial strength	0.0
2.6	Hours and days of operation	5.0
<b>3</b>	<b>Community and Diversity</b>	<b>25</b>
3.1	Workforce diversity	7.0
3.2	Wages and benefits	7.0
3.3	Subcontractors and suppliers (COBID)	7.0
3.4	Community relations commitment	4.0
<b>4</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>35</b>

Table 6. Scores Assigned by Evaluation Committees to Disposal Proposals

ID#	Evaluation Criteria	CRL-MCS	FBL-MCS	RRL-MCS	WCL-MCS	CRL-MSS	FBL-MSS	RRL-MSS	WCL-MSS	CRL-Both	FBL-Both	RRL-Both
<b>1</b>	<b>Environmental</b>											
1.1	Landfill gas emissions	3.5	3.5	3.5	2.3	3.5	3.5	3.5	2.3	3.5	3.5	3.5
1.2	Landfill beneficial use	3.5	4.1	3.8	2.5	3.5	4.1	3.8	2.5	3.5	4.1	3.8
1.3	Permit compliance	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.5
1.4	Sustainable practices proposed	3.9	3.8	3.1	3.0	3.9	3.8	3.1	3.0	3.9	3.8	3.1
<b>2</b>	<b>Operational Risk</b>											
2.1	Transportation interface	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.3
2.2	Contingency plans	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.0	3.5	3.8	3.8	2.6	3.5	3.8	3.8
2.3	Safety procedures and performance	3.6	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.6	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.6	4.1	3.9
2.4	Emergency procedures	3.8	3.6	3.1	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.1	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.1
2.5	Financial strength	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
2.6	Hours and days of operation	3.5	2.8	3.5	2.8	3.5	2.8	3.5	2.8	3.5	2.8	3.5
<b>3</b>	<b>Community and Diversity</b>											
3.1	Workforce diversity	5.0	3.3	5.8	3.0	5.0	3.3	5.8	3.0	5.0	3.3	5.8
3.2	Wages and benefits	5.3	5.0	6.0	5.3	5.3	5.0	6.0	5.3	5.3	5.0	6.0
3.3	Subcontractors and suppliers (COBID)	4.7	0.7	4.3	0.7	4.7	0.7	4.3	0.7	4.7	0.7	4.3
3.4	Community relations commitment	3.7	2.3	4.0	2.7	3.7	2.3	4.0	2.7	3.7	2.3	4.0
<b>4</b>	<b>Cost</b>	29.5	11.5	28.2	35.0	29.5	12.7	28.2	35.0	35.0	19.7	32.9
Note: Totals may not add because of rounding.												

### 3.4.3 Transportation Proposal Scoring Summary

The total scores for Transportation proposals for transfer station and landfill combinations are shown in the tables below; Table 7 (for transport to Columbia Ridge Landfill) and Table 8 (for transport to Finley Buttes, Roosevelt Regional, and Wasco County Landfills). As shown, Walsh is the highest scoring transportation proposer for all combinations to Columbia Ridge, Roosevelt Regional, and Wasco County Landfills. LTI is the highest scoring proposer for all combinations to the Finley Buttes Landfill.

Note: Total Scores are comparable only from a single transfer station to a single landfill. For example, the Walsh score of 74.6 from Metro Central Station to Columbia Ridge Landfill can be compared only to the three other proposals from Metro Central Station to Columbia Ridge Landfill and cannot be compared to the proposals from Metro South Station to Columbia Ridge Landfill.

### 3.4.4 Disposal Proposal Scoring Summary

The total scores for Transportation proposals for transfer station and landfill combinations are shown in Table 9. As shown, Roosevelt Regional Landfill is the highest scoring disposal proposal for waste from Metro Central Station and Metro South Station only: Columbia Ridge Landfill is the highest scoring disposal proposal for waste from both transfer stations.

Note: Total Scores are comparable only from a single transfer station to a single landfill. For example, the Walsh score of 74.6 from Metro Central Station to Columbia Ridge Landfill can be compared only to the three other proposals from Metro Central Station to Columbia Ridge Landfill and cannot be compared to the proposals from Metro South Station to Columbia Ridge Landfill.

**Table 7. Total Scores for Transportation Proposals to Columbia Ridge Landfill**

Evaluation Criteria		LTI - MCS to CRL	TW - MCS to CRL	Walsh - MCS to CRL	WM - MCS to CRL	LTI - MSS to CRL	Walsh - MSS to CRL	WM - MSS to CRL	LTI - Both to CRL	Walsh - Both to CRL	WM - Both to CRL
<b>Total Score</b>		<b>56.3</b>	<b>41.5</b>	<b>74.6</b>	<b>67.2</b>	<b>58.7</b>	<b>74.7</b>	<b>64.3</b>	<b>60.1</b>	<b>75.4</b>	<b>69.0</b>
1	Operational Considerations/Reduction of Risk to Metro	15.3	10.1	16.2	15.1	15.3	16.2	15.1	15.7	16.9	15.3
2	Environmental	16.2	4.6	13.1	10.3	16.2	13.2	8.9	16.2	13.1	9.6
3	Community and Diversity	13.2	11.8	5.3	12.3	13.2	5.3	12.3	13.2	5.3	12.3
4	Cost	11.7	15.0	40.0	29.4	14.1	40.0	27.9	15.0	40.0	31.7

Note: Total Scores are comparable only from a single transfer station to a single landfill. For example, the Walsh score of 74.6 from Metro Central to Columbia Ridge Landfill can be compared only to the three other proposals from Metro Central to Columbia Ridge Landfill and cannot be compared to the proposals from Metro South Station to Columbia Ridge. Totals may not add because of rounding.

**Table 8. Scores Assigned by Evaluation Committees to Transportation Proposals to Finley Buttes, Roosevelt Regional, and Wasco County Landfills**

Evaluation Criteria		LTI - MCS to FB	TW - MCS to FB	LTI - MSS to FB	LTI - Both to FB	LTI - MCS to RRL	Walsh - MCS to RRL	LTI - MSS to RRL	Walsh - MSS to RRL	LTI - Both to RRL	Walsh - Both to RRL	LTI - MCS to WCL	Walsh - MCS to WCL	LTI - MSS to WCL	Walsh - MSS to WCL
<b>Total Score</b>		<b>73.9</b>	<b>66.5</b>	<b>87.6</b>	<b>88.1</b>	<b>69.6</b>	<b>77.8</b>	<b>71.9</b>	<b>77.8</b>	<b>72.8</b>	<b>78.6</b>	<b>47.6</b>	<b>76.7</b>	<b>47.6</b>	<b>76.9</b>
1	Operational Considerations/Reduction of Risk to Metro	15.3	10.1	15.3	15.7	15.3	16.2	15.3	16.2	15.6	16.9	15.3	16.2	15.3	16.2
2	Environmental	16.2	4.6	19.2	19.2	19.2	16.3	19.2	16.3	19.2	16.3	19.2	15.2	19.2	15.4
3	Community and Diversity	13.2	11.8	13.2	13.2	13.2	5.3	13.2	5.3	13.2	5.3	13.2	5.3	13.2	5.3
4	Cost	29.3	40.0	40.0	40.0	22.0	40.0	24.3	40.0	24.8	40.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	40.0

Note: Total Scores are comparable only from a single transfer station to a single landfill. For example, the LTI score of 73.9 from Metro Central Station to Finley Buttes can be compared only to the Tidewater (TW) proposals from Metro Central Station to Finley Buttes and cannot be compared to the proposals from Metro South Station to Finley Buttes. Totals may not add because of rounding.

**Table 9. Total Scores for Disposal Proposals**

Evaluation Criteria		CRL-MCS	FBL-MCS	RRL-MCS	WCL-MCS	CRL-MSS	FBL-MSS	RRL-MSS	WCL-MSS	CRL-Both	FBL-Both	RRL-Both
<b>Total Scores</b>		<b>76.0</b>	<b>51.4</b>	<b>76.2</b>	<b>68.3</b>	<b>76.0</b>	<b>52.6</b>	<b>76.2</b>	<b>68.1</b>	<b>81.4</b>	<b>59.6</b>	<b>80.9</b>
1	Environmental	17.0	18.4	17.3	12.2	17.0	18.4	17.3	12.2	17.0	18.4	17.3
2	Operational Risk	10.8	10.2	10.5	9.4	10.8	10.2	10.5	9.2	10.8	10.2	10.5
3	Community and Diversity	18.7	11.3	20.2	11.7	18.7	11.3	20.2	11.7	18.7	11.3	20.2
4	Cost	29.5	11.5	28.2	35.0	29.5	12.7	28.2	35.0	35.0	19.7	32.9

Note: Totals may not add because of rounding.

## 3.5 Disposal Proposer Interviews

As provided for on page 5 of Metro's RFP, Metro decided to request interviews with the proposers prior to final selection of firm(s) to allow them to clarify or expand on their proposal. The interviews were worth 25 points. Metro elected to interview all qualified disposal proposers, and those interviews took place on May 18, 2018. Metro requested participation by at most three representatives from each landfill.

The presentations were evaluated by eight scoring panelists with three Metro support staff. The panel was made up of three Metro staff, three government solid waste experts outside Metro, and two representatives from community organizations with expertise in diversity, equity and inclusion.

### 3.5.1 Interview Process

The purpose of the interviews was to give Metro a better understanding of who it might want to partner with and to probe a little deeper on questions already answered in proposals. Metro recognized that the stated page limit may have resulted in there being additional information proposers would have liked to share about how they operate and contribute to the environment and the community. The interviews allowed for some greater exploration into aspects of the proposals that Metro was particularly interested in or about which Metro wanted clarification.

As noted in Section 2, proposals were scored out of a 100-point maximum, and the interviews could add up to 25 more points to the points scored by a proposer. Metro used the total of 125 points as the basis for choosing the highest-ranked proposer.

Proposers were sent the questions in advance to give them an opportunity to prepare. The interview questions were as follows:

1. (Environment) What sets your landfill's environmental benefits apart from others? What programs are in place to ensure peak performance and reduce downtime? How does your landfill gas to energy project maximize gas utilization at the landfill and achieve optimal benefits to the end user and the environment? What other environmental innovations are you planning at your landfill?
2. (Operations) Walk us through each step of the process of disposing of Metro's waste, from receiving waste at the gate to a driver leaving with an empty container. Who is responsible for which steps? Illustrate expected times involved with all aspects needed to get the truck back on the road with an empty trailer including turn times, tippers, and priority given to Metro waste. (bring an aerial image or map of your landfill - large size)
3. (Operations) Describe details of the arrangements you have made to accommodate Metro's waste in the event of the closure or inability to reach your primary landfill. Address pricing, tipper operation and priority, turn times. Details should include how long it would take to implement your plan, and a description of impact to the transfer station operator and transporter.
4. (Cost) Describe an accounting of all the fee components in the prices that you proposed. Explain who you believe is responsible for paying each component.
5. (Community and Diversity) Discuss your county host fees. What projects have been funded with such fees over the last few years, and how does the county decide how to prioritize and spend host fee revenue?

6. (Community and Diversity) Metro defines diversity as the variance or difference amongst people, such as race, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, nationality, language preference, socioeconomic status, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity and others. Please explain what sets your landfill apart from others in community and diversity.
7. (Operations) You provided current jurisdictions you receive waste from for references based on experience and qualifications. How would future customers within Metro's jurisdiction be accommodated if they wished to leverage Metro's contractual arrangement with your landfill?

Each proposer was given about an hour for the formal Q&A, with the interview panel asking one or two follow up questions per interview question, depending on time. This means about 10 minutes per question. Metro staff read each question out loud and after the proposer's response, panel members asked follow-up questions. After the last question is answered, proposers were invited to conclude on any final items they wanted to report about their operation.

### 3.5.2 Interview Results

The results of the interview scoring are shown in Tables 10 and 11, below. As shown, Columbia Ridge Landfill scored the highest among the proposers for all combinations (from Metro Central and Metro South individually and from both transfer stations).

## 3.6 Final Evaluation Results and Next Steps

The results of the proposal and interview scoring are shown in Table 12. As shown, Columbia Ridge Landfill scored the highest among the landfill proposers for all combinations (from Metro Central and Metro South individually and from both transfer stations). As noted in Section 3.4.3 and Tables 7 and 8, Walsh was the high scoring proposer for all Transportation combinations.

Metro commenced negotiations with Walsh for Transportation and Waste Management for Disposal, and successfully negotiated contracts with each firm to take effect January 1, 2020. The contracts have been signed pending the 7-day waiting period after the Notice of Intent to Award issued on November 13, 2018.

Table 10. Scores Assigned by Interview Panelists

Question	Points Available	Columbia Ridge	Finely Buttes	Roosevelt	Wasco County
Environment – Landfill environmental benefits	4	4.0	3.4	3.9	2.4
Operations – Logistics of on-site disposal	4	3.6	3.3	2.9	3.3
Operations – Contingency plan in event of landfill closure	4	2.4	3.1	2.8	2.9
Cost – Accounting of fee components	1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Community and Diversity – County host fees	4	2.8	2.4	2.8	1.9
Community and Diversity – Landfill diversity	4	2.5	1.4	2.2	1.3
Operations – Accommodating future customers within Metro boundaries	4	2.1	2.7	2.0	2.7
<b>Total Points</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>15.5</b>
Note: Totals may not add because of rounding.					

Table 11. Total Scores for Disposal Interviews

Evaluation Criteria	CRL-MCS	FBL-MCS	RRL-MCS	WCL-MCS	CRL-MSS	FBL-MSS	RRL-MSS	WCL-MSS	CRL-Both	FBL-Both	RRL-Both
<b>Interview Scores</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>17.5</b>

Table 12. Total Scores for Disposal Interviews

Evaluation Criteria	CRL-MCS	FBL-MCS	RRL-MCS	WCL-MCS	CRL-MSS	FBL-MSS	RRL-MSS	WCL-MSS	CRL-Both	FBL-Both	RRL-Both
<b>Proposal Scores</b>	<b>76.0</b>	<b>51.4</b>	<b>76.2</b>	<b>68.3</b>	<b>76.0</b>	<b>52.6</b>	<b>76.2</b>	<b>68.1</b>	<b>81.4</b>	<b>59.6</b>	<b>80.9</b>
<b>Interview Scores</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>17.6</b>
<b>Total Scores</b>	<b>94.4</b>	<b>68.7</b>	<b>93.8</b>	<b>83.8</b>	<b>94.4</b>	<b>69.9</b>	<b>93.8</b>	<b>83.6</b>	<b>99.8</b>	<b>76.9</b>	<b>98.5</b>