

# METRO COUNCIL

## Work Session Worksheet

**PRESENTATION DATE:** July 18, 2017      **LENGTH:** 60 minutes

**PRESENTATION TITLE:** Transport and Disposal RFP Evaluation Criteria Weighing for Public Transfer Stations

**DEPARTMENT:** Property and Environmental Services

**PRESENTER(S):** Paul Slyman, 503-797-1510, paul.slyman@oregonmetro.gov  
Will Elder, 503-797-1581, will.elder@oregonmetro.gov  
Dan Pitzler, CH2M, 425-233-3592, dan.pitzler@ch2m.com

### WORK SESSION PURPOSE & DESIRED OUTCOMES

- Purpose: To review the evaluation criteria and weights related to transportation and disposal procurement.
- Outcome: Provide the public, stakeholders and the procurement team a clear understanding of the values and priorities Metro Council would like to see from this transportation solicitation.

### TOPIC BACKGROUND & FRAMING THE WORK SESSION DISCUSSION

Under Oregon law and the Metro Charter, Metro is responsible for management of the region's garbage and recycling system. Since 1990, by contract Metro has delivered or caused to be delivered 90 percent of the landfill-bound putrescible waste that is generated within its jurisdictional boundary to landfills owned by Waste Management, Inc. That contractual arrangement is set to expire on December 31, 2019, and Metro must procure replacement services.

As owner of two solid waste transfer stations, Metro Central in Northwest Portland and Metro South in Oregon City, Metro seeks to enter into new contractual arrangements to transport and dispose of the roughly 500,000 tons per year of garbage that is consolidated for disposal at these two facilities. Staff proposes to use this procurement to identify the transport and landfill option(s) that best serve the region and maximize public benefits.

On May 2<sup>nd</sup>, staff recommended to Council maintaining separate transport and disposal contracts. The main advantage to this approach is to maximize public benefits. Each of the two services we will procure, transport and disposal, may have different impacts on public benefits. The proposed criteria weights reflect staff's understanding of both the importance and the expected variability of responses. For attributes that will not vary a lot among proposers, criteria weights are relatively lower. For important attributes that are expected to vary a lot and hence, differentiate among proposers, those evaluation criteria should be weighted relatively more.

Metro is seeking a transportation contractor who will deliver waste for disposal in the most environmentally friendly manner that also provides good value for the public's money and advances other public benefits, such as flexibility and diversity, equity, and inclusion. Public benefits have formed the basis for development of evaluation criteria for the selection of the highest ranked proposers in this process.

The following evaluation criteria are being proposed for the transportation request for proposal:

- Environmental Impacts (e.g., CO<sub>2</sub>e, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM, neighborhood disruption)
- Operational Approach, Experience and Reduction of Risk to Metro (e.g., safety, contingency and emergency plans, maintenance, reliability, financial strength)
- Community and Diversity (e.g., workforce diversity, wages/benefits, COBID, community relations)
- Budget/Cost Proposal

Likewise, Metro is seeking the next long term landfill that will provide the greatest benefit in protecting the public's health, protecting the environment and get a good value for the public's money. If time permits, we will also review the following proposed disposal request for proposal evaluation criteria. If we are unable to get to these criteria, we will return to the August 1 Council work session to discuss. The proposed disposal criteria are:

- Environmental
- Operational Considerations/Reduction of Risk to Metro
- Community and Diversity
- Cost

Staff will show the linkage between public benefits, the evaluation criteria from the 2008 Transportation RFP, and proposed criteria for this Transportation RFP. Staff will propose points for each evaluation criterion (that add up to 100) as a starting point, and ask Council if they would prefer a different allocation of points. If time allows, the same will be done with the disposal criteria.

#### **QUESTIONS FOR COUNCIL CONSIDERATION**

- Does Council support the proposed evaluation criteria and point allocation?
- Does Council have any other comments or suggestions about the procurement?

#### **PACKET MATERIALS**

- Would legislation be required for Council action ☐ Yes ☒ No
- No additional materials