

Regional Solid Waste & Organics Infrastructure Assessment Addendum

Date: September 30th, 2026

Purpose: The purpose of this addendum is to make available answers to questions received about proposals for the Regional Solid Waste and Organics Infrastructure Assessment.

1. Has CPRC set a budget for this project?

CPRC received \$1 million from the EPA through the Climate Pollution Reduction Grants (CPRG) program for a four-year period spanning 2023–2027. CPRC will be allocating part of this budget to this assessment, which supports the broader grant goal of identifying regional strategies to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and climate pollution. The assessment will help inform future regional coordination and solid waste infrastructure planning; funding and scope for any subsequent work have not yet been determined.

2. Would the cover, cover letter, or table of contents count toward the page limit?

No. The cover page, cover letter, and table of contents will not count toward the 20-page limit. Resumes are also excluded, as stated in the RFP.

3. Are we able to use font sizes smaller than 12pt for headers, footers, charts, graphics, and other elements apart from the main body text of the proposal as long as the text is legible?

Yes. Main body text must use a standard 12-point font. Other elements may use smaller fonts, provided all text remains legible and is no smaller than 10 points.

4. What level of financial analysis is expected under Task D (planning-level estimates versus detailed lifecycle financial modeling)?

CPRC expects a planning-level comparison of the estimated costs to implement and operate the priority alternatives, including capital, operating, and transportation costs, potential revenue, and avoided costs. Assumptions and data limitations should be

documented. Detailed engineering estimates or investment-grade financial modeling are not expected.

5. How many regional alternatives does CPRC expect respondents to evaluate in Task C.

CPRC is not seeking a set number of alternatives. Respondents should propose a manageable number of distinct alternatives that allows for meaningful comparison within the available budget and project timeframe. Alternatives should address the use, expansion, or optimization of existing facilities and compare these with new infrastructure where appropriate. The final alternatives will be refined by CPRC and the Consortium.

6. What existing studies, tonnage data, cost data, and facility information will be provided at project initiation?

CPRC will coordinate with participating jurisdictions to identify and share available studies, tonnage data, cost information, and facility information relevant to the agreed-upon scope. Respondents should also use relevant NC Department of Environmental Quality/Division of Environmental Assistance and Customer Service information and local studies, such as Wake County's Beyond the South Wake Landfill Study, where available.

7. What level of stakeholder engagement is anticipated (number of interviews, workshops, and presentations)?

CPRC anticipates 1–2 individual interviews with each participating jurisdiction, 2–3 presentations or workshops with the Consortium as a whole, and ongoing email coordination with CPRC and Consortium members for project updates and follow-up questions. No public-facing community engagement or external workshops are expected as part of this assessment. Targeted conversations with relevant private-sector stakeholders remain part of Task C, as outlined in the RFP. CPRC will work with the consultant to produce final deliverables that include clear, accessible materials that member jurisdictions can readily use to communicate findings and recommendations to their leadership and other audiences.

8. What are the Consortium's primary desired outcomes: a preferred strategy, implementation roadmap, future infrastructure plan, funding strategy, or all of the above?

The primary outcomes are regional yard waste and composting strategy alternatives and potential implementation plans, supported by an infrastructure overview, baseline data, financial comparisons, and GHG estimates. Recommendations should address infrastructure needs, governance, partnerships, and potential funding approaches. The assessment should establish a foundation for future investment decisions and identify where further analysis or stakeholder engagement is needed before implementation.

9. Are the proposal requirements' structure and order of #1-7 in Section VI of the RFP a strict requirement, or can these sections be combined and/or streamlined in our RFP response?

Respondents may combine or reorganize sections, provided all required elements are included and clearly identifiable. Separate scopes, deliverables, schedules, and costs for each proposed task must still be provided as requested in the RFP.

10. In Section IV, #7, what is the intention of "Optional Services pricing"? Are there specific options for pricing the Council would like us to include?

Optional services pricing, listed in Section VI, item 7, refers to additional services respondents believe would add value beyond their proposed approach to the requested scope. CPRC has not determined specific optional services. Any proposed options should be clearly described and priced separately, including their purpose and additional deliverables.

11. From Task A, "map and GIS data of existing solid waste infrastructure", please confirm that this should include all Public and Private facilities within the Central Pines Regional Council area? Should the inventory be limited to within the participating jurisdictions listed in Section I of the RFP?

The inventory should focus on major public and private solid waste facilities that serve, or could reasonably serve, the participating jurisdictions listed in Section I, regardless of whether those facilities are located within the CPRC region. This includes facilities that receive or process participating jurisdictions' materials or represent significant system dependencies.

12. For Task B, is CPRC expecting the consultant team to perform a comprehensive baseline life cycle assessment (LCA) or a screening-level LCA? A comprehensive LCA relies on primary, site-specific supply chain and process data and provides a highly rigorous and detailed assessment – it is more resource-intensive, time-consuming, and requires external expert review.

However, a screening-level LCA utilizes secondary datasets, generic databases, and broad assumptions to provide a higher-level assessment with a faster turnaround time.

Given the available project budget referenced in Question 1, a screening-level GHG assessment is likely the most appropriate approach. CPRC will rely on the selected consultant's technical expertise to recommend a methodology that meets the project's objectives within the allotted budget. The analysis should use available data, reasonable estimates, and documented assumptions to establish a baseline and compare priority alternatives under Task C.

13. Should food waste and other organic waste generated from industrial, commercial, and institutional (ICI) sectors, as well as agricultural sources, be included in the GHG emissions assessment?

CPRC will rely on the selected consultant's technical expertise to recommend whether data from industrial, commercial, institutional, and agricultural sources should be included, based on their relevance to participating jurisdictions' existing management systems, priority regional alternatives, and data availability. The primary focus remains yard waste and composting, with consideration of phased expansion into broader organics management.

14. How many alternative management scenarios or strategies does CPRC expect to be evaluated as part of the GHG emissions assessment?

CPRC is not seeking a set number of scenarios for the GHG emissions assessment. These scenarios should align with the regional alternatives evaluated under Task C, as described in the response to Question 5. Respondents should propose a manageable number that allows for meaningful comparison within the available budget and project timeframe. The final scenarios will be refined by CPRC and the Consortium.

15. Does CPRC have a preferred planning horizon (e.g., 10, 20, or 30 years) for evaluating cumulative GHG benefits and infrastructure investments?

CPRC suggests considering 2035 and 2050 as reference points [for alignment with EPA's CCAP planning guidance](#). The final planning horizon will be confirmed with CPRC and the Consortium.

16. What is the ideal time frame for "near-, medium-, and long-term actions" recommended by the consultant?

The RFP does not prescribe specific year ranges. Respondents should recommend timeframes reflecting the readiness and complexity of proposed actions. Near-term actions should emphasize improved coordination and use of existing facilities, while medium- and long-term actions may address additional studies, partnerships, funding, or infrastructure development.

17. Section VII says CPRC "will select the lowest responsive, responsible bidder" and then gives a 100-point weighted rubric where cost is only 20%. Can CPRC clarify which one governs?

CPRC intends to award based on the evaluation criteria and weighted scoring rubric contained in the solicitation. Total project cost is a large part of the decision, but the lowest bidder is not always the most responsible choice since their credentials, previous experience, and methodology and technical approach may not best meet the needs of the project and its partners.

18. In the RFP, it states for the purposes of this RFP, "the region includes the participating jurisdictions of Apex, Carrboro, Cary, Chapel Hill, Chatham County, Durham, Durham County, Hillsborough, Holly Springs, Orange County, Raleigh, and Wake County". Wake County includes 10 total municipalities including Raleigh, Holly Springs, Apex, Cary, Fuquay-Varina, Garner, Zebulon, Wendell, Knightdale, Morrisville, and Rolesville. Chatham County has three municipalities Pittsboro, Siler City, and Goldston. If a municipality was not specifically included, is it excluded from the solid waste system analysis?

The jurisdictions listed in the RFP define the participating entities. Municipalities not listed should not be treated as a participant requiring its own data collection and recommendations. Facilities, material flow, and county-operated services involving those municipalities should be considered when relevant to participating counties' systems and regional alternatives. Respondents should avoid double-counting county and municipal data.

19. Section IV, Task C references engagement with "relevant private haulers, processors, facility operators, community organizations, and other stakeholders, as appropriate" to identify current and potential regional participants. For purposes of the building the scope:

- a. **Will CPRC provide a list of private haulers, processors, and other private-sector contacts to be engaged, or is the consultant expected to independently identify and reach out to these parties?**

CPRC will coordinate with participating jurisdictions to compile and share a list of private-sector contacts based on their existing relationships. The consultant will be expected to use its expertise to identify gaps and additional potential partners, then coordinate directly with identified contacts for data collection and engagement.

- b. **Does CPRC have an expected or approximate number of private sector stakeholder engagements (e.g., haulers, processors, facility operators) anticipated for this task?**

CPRC does not have an expected number of engagements. Respondents should propose targeted engagement sufficient to understand relevant processing models, collect necessary data, and identify participants in current or potential regional efforts within the available project budget and timelines. Proposals may include the anticipated number and type of engagements.

20. Beyond a facility's permit size/classification (e.g., Large Type 1), permitted area, and type, is there anything else CPRC wants documented here?

We will defer this decision and technical guidance to the vendor that we choose.

21. For GHG impacts is the expectation to use the EPA WARM model or would more detailed LCA modeling be required?

CPRC has not prescribed a specific modeling approach and will rely on the consultant's expertise to recommend an appropriate methodology. EPA WARM is anticipated to be a likely option, but respondents should explain their recommended approach and its suitability for the project's scope, available data, and budget. Methods, assumptions, and data sources should be clearly documented.

22. Will member communities share their yard waste collection, hauling and processing contracts, tip fees and facility budgets? Will CPRC coordinate those data requests?

Participating jurisdictions are aware of the assessment and willing to share available information relevant to the agreed-upon scope. CPRC will coordinate requests through designated jurisdiction contacts.

Availability will vary by jurisdiction, and respondents should not assume every requested record or data element will be available. The consultant should identify priority data needs, document gaps and assumptions, and handle information in accordance with Section V of the RFP.