

— BK-CS-2026-05 / C · TENDER INSIGHT

PRE-BID INTELLIGENCE · MATERIALS MANAGEMENT · STATE OF MICHIGAN

Where this bid is *won and lost.*

Strategic read of RFP 2026-08 — what the 100-point matrix really weighs, where the 70+ competitors are, what EGLE will reward, the \$390K–\$620K pricing band, and the twelve risks worth pricing in.

SOLICITATION

RFP 2026-08
Bay County · Michigan

COMPETITIVE FIELD

70+ organisations
Michigan-based cluster strongest

EVALUATION MASS

60 of 100 points on team & approach
Fee carries only 10 of 100

ESTIMATED BUDGET

\$390K – \$620K
Mid-range \$510K · EGLE grant-funded

WIN-THEME HYPOTHESIS

PA 451 specialist + EGLE grant veteran
+ named EJ methodology

ENGAGEMENT FILE

BK-CS-2026-05
Bay County MMP · Pre-bid pursuit

Two clients, *one envelope*.

Bay County's Finance Department Purchasing Division runs a structured, rules-based procurement under Michigan law. The solicitation was issued on behalf of the **Department of Environmental Affairs and Community Development** — meaning Purchasing administers procedure while the technical client sits in a separate department. This split matters: the proposal must satisfy both Finance's procedural checks *and* Environmental Affairs' substantive expectations. Proposals that read as purely administrative checklists will score poorly on the 30-point Understanding-and-Approach criterion.

The reserved-rights language is standard Michigan municipal boilerplate but carries real teeth. The County explicitly reserves the right to reject any or all bids and to waive irregularities. The **5% liquidated damages** clause for late withdrawal after selection signals the County has been burned before — submission should be treated as binding commitment.

The evaluation committee draws from both County staff and appointed members of the Materials Management Planning Committee. **Scoring will be done by people who understand the technical subject matter**, not procurement generalists. Generic consulting language will be visible to evaluators who know what an MMP requires.

The solicitation does not identify a known incumbent. The 2015 Solid Waste Plan was prepared by an unknown firm, and the RFP makes no reference to an existing vendor relationship. The download list already exceeds **70 organisations** at publication, with Michigan-based environmental and engineering firms as the strongest cluster. Out-of-state firms from CA, NY, OH, and TX have also downloaded — suggesting national competition for a county-level project. The 25-point experience weight is the primary differentiator for Michigan-based firms with existing EGLE relationships.

The EGLE grant funding backstop is critical context. Bay County is not spending discretionary funds; it is administering a state planning grant. The selected consultant must comply with **EGLE reporting requirements** and grant conditions, not just County contract terms. Bidders who have worked directly with EGLE on similar plans have a structural advantage that should be named explicitly in the proposal.

Sixty points on you, *ten on price.*

ANALYST ASSESSMENT

This RFP is not primarily about finding the cheapest consultant. The fee proposal carries only 10 of 100 points. The County is buying expertise, relationships, and the ability to navigate a politically complex public process. Sixty points are directly tied to who you are and what you have done — not what you charge.

The evaluation weight on **Similar Project Experience (25 points)** is the loudest signal in this document. Bay County wants consultants who have done this before — specifically materials management or solid waste planning *under Michigan law, for Michigan municipalities*. The Act reference throughout (Michigan PA 451, Part 115, effective March 29, 2023) is recent legislation. Experience preparing plans under the **new Act**, not just the old solid waste regime, will be decisive. If a bidder has already guided another Michigan county through this exact EGLE process, that single credential is worth more than years of general environmental consulting experience.

The timeline pressure is real and deliberately built in. The June 22, 2027 completion deadline is driven by legislative requirements, not County preference. The solicitation closes June 5, 2026; work must finish within ~12.5 months. The Act's approval process (§ 324.11575) includes mandatory public comment periods, committee approvals, Board of Commissioners adoption, and EGLE submission — sequential steps that cannot be compressed. A bidder who proposes an unrealistic schedule will be penalised; one who demonstrates they understand exactly how the statutory timeline constrains the project will stand out.

The emphasis on **equity and disadvantaged communities** appears in the scope at least three times. This is not decorative language. EGLE's Sustainable Materials Management Pyramid and the County's call for equitable access signal that the plan will be evaluated in part on whether it addresses environmental-justice communities. Bidders should name specific methodologies for reaching these communities — not just list them as stakeholders.

Watch out for: the instruction that the County will not hire an outside law firm. The consultant team is expected to supply sufficient legal/regulatory knowledge of PA 451 and Part 115 to draft the plan without external counsel. Teams without in-house Michigan environmental-law expertise should address this risk directly — through a qualified sub-consultant or a team member with that background.

Seven clauses *worth pricing in.*

CLAUSE	WHAT IT SAYS	WHAT IT MEANS FOR THE PRIME
PA 451, Part 115	Plan must meet all EGLE requirements under the Act	Team needs direct knowledge of § 324.11578 plan content requirements
No outside law firm	County will not hire external legal counsel	Consultant must supply legal/regulatory expertise in-house
EGLE grant compliance	Consultant must meet all grant reporting requirements	Budget and deliverables must align with EGLE grant terms
Liquidated damages	5% of bid amount on late withdrawal after selection	Do not submit unless the team is fully committed to deliver
FOIA exposure	Bids subject to Michigan FOIA after opening	Fee proposal and business info become public record
Non-discrimination	Mandatory compliance in hiring and performance	Applies to all staff including sub-consultants — material breach if violated
Insurance timing	CoI due 10 working days before project start	Insurance must be in place at award, not just at submission

4.1 · Governing Law and Jurisdiction

Michigan state law governs. Michigan PA 451 of 1994 (Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act), Part 115 (as amended effective March 29, 2023) governs the plan development requirements. Disputes arising from the procurement are handled through the County's internal protest mechanism before any court action. Michigan courts govern contract disputes. Bidders outside Michigan should understand Michigan contract law applies throughout.

4.2 · Set-Aside Analysis

Full and Open competition. No set-aside requirements apply. Any qualified firm may submit.

4.3 · OCI Exposure

No explicit OCI clause in the RFP. However, firms with existing financial relationships with Bay County landfill operators, waste haulers, or MRF operators should disclose these relationships in the proposal. The SOAR Analysis and Gap Analysis tasks require objective assessment of existing infrastructure; undisclosed relationships with those providers could constitute a conflict after award.

4.4 · Teaming and NDA Requirements for Offshore Teams

The RFP does not restrict offshore involvement explicitly. However, the on-site nature of community engagement, stakeholder meetings, public hearings, and Board presentations requires physical presence in Bay County. Offshore support for proposal development and background research must be covered by a teaming or subcontractor agreement that includes: confidentiality of all Bay County data and EGLE grant materials; restriction on use of bid materials for any purpose other than this engagement; compliance with Michigan data protection standards; and identification of the US Prime as the sole contracting party with Bay County.

4.5 · Protest Risk

Protest window is **10 working days from Notice of Intent to Award**. Grounds typically include procedural error, evaluation scoring inconsistency, or failure to follow the RFP's evaluation criteria. The highest protest risk for a winning bidder is a challenge to the experience score. Proposals should document project examples with specificity: county name, scope, total value, PA 451 relevance, completion date.

§ 5 · MASTER COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST

Twenty checks, *scored or pass/fail.*

#	REQUIREMENT	RFP SECTION	PASS/FAIL OR SCORED	ACTION
1	Six (6) sealed physical copies submitted	Bid Delivery	Pass/Fail	Prepare and count copies before delivery
2	Delivered by June 5, 2026, 11:00 AM EDT	Cover Page	Pass/Fail	Confirm courier delivery window; do not rely on mail
3	Bid Response Cover Sheet as page 1	Required Docs	Pass/Fail	Complete and sign; reproduce on letterhead
4	Bidders Checklist completed and signed	Required Docs	Pass/Fail	Every yes/no item answered; signed by officer
5	Certificate A signed	Attachment A	Pass/Fail	Signed by authorised representative
6	Letter of Transmittal included	Proposal Content	Scored	Confirm understanding; name authorised contact; state binding authority
7	Fee Proposal as separate sealed document	Fee Proposal	Scored (10)	Seal separately; label clearly; not-to-exceed by task
8	Per-meeting cost for Task 7.7 included	Task 7.7	Scored	Provide NTE per meeting cost for municipal board meetings
9	Two project examples (last 5 years) in Firm Profile	Firm Profile	Scored (25)	Select PA 451 or solid-waste-planning examples; include costs and dates
10	Three professional references with current contacts	Firm Profile	Scored	Verify contacts; references on similar projects
11	Project Manager identified by name	Proposal Content	Scored (10)	Name PM; attach resume; demonstrate relevant experience
12	Key personnel resumes provided	Firm Profile	Scored (15)	One resume per key team member; match roles to scope tasks
13	Milestone work plan with project dates	Project Approach	Scored (30)	Show phase-by-phase timeline through June 22, 2027
14	Signed addenda returned with proposal	Addenda	Pass/Fail	Monitor through May 22; sign and include any issued
15	Insurance CoI within 10 days of award	Insurance	Pass/Fail post-award	Confirm carrier can name County as additional insured
16	Proposal valid for 90 days	General Info 2	Pass/Fail	Confirm in transmittal letter
17	EGLE grant compliance commitment	Project Funding	Scored	Acknowledge EGLE grant requirements; note prior experience if applicable

#	REQUIREMENT	RFP SECTION	PASS/FAIL OR SCORED	ACTION
18	Non-discrimination compliance	General Info 11	Pass/Fail	Affirmative statement; applies to all team and subs
19	Principal office location identified	Firm Profile	Scored	State project base; proximity to Bay County is a differentiator
20	Resource availability statement	Firm Profile	Scored (10)	Confirm team availability for full duration; name backups

§ 6 · PROPOSED TEAM STRUCTURE

Ten roles, *seven core + three subs.*

#	ROLE	RESPONSIBILITIES	REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS
1	Project Manager	Day-to-day client contact; budget, schedule, invoicing; progress meeting facilitation	10+ years environmental/planning; prior MMP PM experience; Michigan preferred
2	PA 451 / Regulatory Specialist	Ensure plan meets PA 451 Part 115; liaise with EGLE; track regulatory updates; draft compliance sections	Deep PA 451 Part 115 (2023 amendments) knowledge; prior EGLE plan approval
3	Community Engagement Lead	Design / execute Public Engagement Plan; stakeholder meetings; SOAR Analysis; online survey	Participatory planning certification; EJ community experience; Michigan engagement
4	Data Analyst / GIS Specialist	Facility inventory; GIS mapping; forecast modelling; waste stream data; market analysis	ArcGIS proficiency; EGLE Mega Data familiarity; solid waste data background
5	Circular Economy / Materials Markets Specialist	Supply chain & market analysis; circular economy opportunities; case studies; BMPs	Recycling commodities markets; circular economy infrastructure planning
6	Implementation / Funding Strategist	Funding action plan; grant identification; PPP modelling; 5–10 year financial projections	EGLE grant experience; municipal environmental finance
7	Graphic Designer / Document Specialist	Plan layout; infographics; maps; charts; data visualisation; final formatting	InDesign, Illustrator, ArcGIS; EGLE-formatted planning documents
8	Organics / Food Waste Specialist	Food waste diversion strategies; organics processing gaps; align with EGLE's 50% goal	Composting, anaerobic digestion, food waste programming; Michigan organics
9	Sub-Consultant: Legal / Policy Analyst	Model ordinances; HCA language; siting; enforcement framework; amendment process	Michigan environmental law; PA 451 siting and enforcement experience
10	Sub-Consultant: Public Survey / Translation	Online survey design and administration; translation for non-English-speaking communities	CLOSUP methodology; multilingual capability

§ 7 · PHASE-BY-PHASE TIMELINE

Seven phases, *twelve months.*

PHASE	WINDOW	TEAM MEMBERS	KEY RESPONSIBILITIES
1 · LAUNCH	Month 1 (Jul 2026)	PM · Regulatory Specialist	Contract execution; kick-off; PMP; Steering Committee formation; GIS data request
2 · STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT	Months 2–4 (Aug–Oct 2026)	Engagement Lead · PM · Survey Sub	Public Engagement Plan; stakeholder list; online survey; SOAR Analysis; workshops
3 · DATA COLLECTION	Months 2–5 (Aug–Nov 2026)	Data Analyst · GIS · Circular Economy	Facility inventory; GIS mapping; previous plan review; market analysis; forecast
4 · ANALYSIS	Months 5–7 (Nov 2026–Jan 2027)	All technical leads	Gap analysis; five case studies; BMPs; policy review; KPI development; funding
5 · IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY	Months 7–8 (Jan–Feb 2027)	PM · Funding Strategist · Legal · Engagement Lead	Funding plan; marketing; siting; enforcement; amendment process
6 · DRAFT PLAN	Months 8–9 (Feb–Mar 2027)	PM · Regulatory · Graphic Designer · all	Draft MMP per § 324.11578; design and mapping; Steering Committee review
7 · ADOPTION	Months 9–12 (Mar–Jun 2027)	PM · Regulatory · Engagement Lead	Planning Committee presentation; 60-day public comment; public hearing; Board adoption

\$390K low, \$510K target, \$620K high.

ANALYST ASSESSMENT

The RFP does not state a budget. EGLE Materials Management Planning Grants in Michigan have historically ranged from \$75K to \$500K+ depending on county size and plan complexity. Bay County (≈ 105,000 population, 35 municipalities) sits mid-tier. A grant-funded project of this scope typically prices between \$350K and \$650K in the Michigan market.

Detailed Budget Estimate

BUDGET CATEGORY	ESTIMATED (USD)	NOTES
Personnel — On-Site (USA)	\$265,000	PM, Engagement Lead, Regulatory Specialist, Funding Strategist
Personnel — Remote / Support	\$164,000	All other roles in § 6
Travel and Accommodation	\$18,000	Bay City site visits, meetings, hearings, Board presentations
GIS / Software Tools	\$8,000	ArcGIS licensing, data visualisation platforms, survey tools
Document Production	\$5,000	InDesign, print-ready PDF, infographic development
Public Engagement Materials	\$6,000	Flyers, social, survey promotion, workshop materials
Administrative / Overhead	\$20,000	PM infrastructure, invoicing, records
Contingency (5%)	\$24,300	Scope adjustments; additional municipal meetings (Task 7.7)
TOTAL ESTIMATED	\$510,300	Mid-range; low ≈ \$420K, high ≈ \$620K

Pricing Scenarios

SCENARIO	TOTAL PRICE (USD)	KEY ASSUMPTION	RISK
Low	\$390,000	Smaller team, 10 municipal meetings, limited travel	Undercapacity; schedule slippage

SCENARIO	TOTAL PRICE (USD)	KEY ASSUMPTION	RISK
Mid (Recommended)	\$510,000	Full team, 15 municipal meetings, standard travel	Balanced - competitive against Michigan peers
High	\$620,000	Expanded engagement, 25+ municipal meetings, additional subs	Above-market perception; requires strong differentiation

PRICING VARIABLE THAT DECIDES THE BID

The single pricing variable that most affects winning is the **per-meeting cost for Task 7.7**. Bay County has 35 municipalities. If adoption requires attendance at 20+ board meetings, this line alone could add \$40K-\$80K. Priced too low: lose money. Priced too high: lose the bid on value perception. A range of **\$800-\$1,500 per meeting** (half-day, including prep and travel) is defensible.

Six factors, *one decisive 30.*

FACTOR	PTS	WHAT EVALUATORS SCORE	PROPOSAL STRATEGY
PM QUALIFICATIONS	10	PM's personal track record on similar plans; Michigan and EGLE depth; engagement leadership	Name PM on page 1 of transmittal; lead resume with most relevant MMP / solid waste plan experience
TEAM QUALIFICATIONS	15	Coverage of all required disciplines; sub-consultant depth; team cohesion and prior collaboration	Present team as a unit; show prior collaborations; fill all 9 discipline gaps from § 6
SIMILAR PROJECT EXPERIENCE	25	Relevance to PA 451, EGLE process, Michigan municipalities, circular economy; recency; comparable scale	Lead with two examples as close to this exact scope as possible; project value, timeline, outcome, EGLE relationship
UNDERSTANDING & APPROACH TO SCOPE	30	Depth of PA 451 understanding; practicality of engagement strategy; milestone plan quality; recognition of timeline constraints	The bid is won or lost here. Devote the largest section of the proposal; show statutory approval path as a timeline; address EJ explicitly; show EGLE format compliance plan
AVAILABILITY OF TEAM	10	Named team members available full duration; no conflicting major commitments	State each member's current workload and availability %; name backups; confirm operating office
FEE PROPOSAL	10	Value for money; reasonableness of hour estimates; clarity of cost breakdown by task	Match fee to task structure; justify hours with task-level detail; do not undercut dramatically

WHERE THE BID IS WON

The 30-point Approach criterion is where the bid is won or lost. A technically perfect response priced at the high end of the market will almost certainly outscore a budget-priced generalist. Build the proposal weight to match the points: 30% of pages on Approach, 25% on Experience, 15% on Team, with the remainder split across PM, Availability, and Fee.

What can go offshore, *what cannot*.

The RFP does not explicitly restrict or permit offshore team involvement. The framework below derives from the on-site attendance requirements and the nature of the deliverables.

TASK	CAN GO OFFSHORE	US PRIME ONLY	HANDLING REQUIREMENT
1.2-1.4 · PMP, PROGRESS MEETING PREP, DOCUMENTATION	Yes	—	Standard confidentiality; NDA required
2.1 · PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PLAN DRAFTING	Yes (draft)	Facilitation	US Prime reviews and presents; offshore prepares written plan
2.2 · ONLINE SURVEY DESIGN	Yes	—	Survey platform must be US-hosted; data stored in USA
2.3-2.4 · SOAR, STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS	No	Yes	Physical attendance required in Bay County
3.1 · PREVIOUS PLAN / STUDY REVIEW	Yes	—	Standard NDA; documents provided by County
3.2 · FACILITY INVENTORY AND GIS	Partial (analysis only)	GIS field work	Offshore can analyse, not collect
3.3-3.4 · MARKET ANALYSIS, FORECAST	Yes	—	Outputs reviewed by US PM
4.1-4.5 · ANALYSIS, CASE STUDIES, BMPS, KPIS	Yes (draft)	Review	All deliverables reviewed/approved by US PM before County submission
5 · IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY CHAPTERS	Yes (draft)	Review	Legal/policy sections reviewed by US-based legal sub
6.1-6.2 · DRAFT PLAN, GRAPHIC DESIGN	Yes	—	File formats per RFP; US PM approves before County delivery
7 · ALL ADOPTION PRESENTATIONS AND HEARINGS	No	Yes	Physical attendance required; Board and committee meetings public record

Twelve risks, *with mitigations and owners.*

#	RISK	LIKELIHOOD	IMPACT	MITIGATION	OWNER
1	EGLE changes plan format requirements after contract award	Medium	High	Confirm EGLE format at kick-off; build flexibility into document design	Regulatory Specialist
2	June 22, 2027 deadline missed due to public comment delays	Medium	High	Map statutory path before start; build 4-week buffer into adoption phase	PM
3	Low public survey response rates reduce data quality	Medium	Medium	Combine online survey with in-person engagement; County comms promotion	Engagement Lead
4	EGLE grant conditions impose unseen restrictions	Low-Med	High	Request full grant agreement at execution; legal review before Task 1 closes	PM · Legal Sub
5	GIS data provided by County is incomplete or incompatible	Medium	Medium	Data inventory at kick-off; contingency hours for cleaning; software compatibility	Data Analyst
6	Stakeholder disagreement delays Planning Committee approval	Low-Med	High	Surface disagreements early via SOAR; conflict resolution in PMP; DPA alignment	PM · Engagement Lead
7	Task 7.7 municipal meeting volume exceeds budget	Medium	Medium	Realistic per-meeting NTE; confirm count with County pre-submission; track monthly	PM
8	Sub-consultant unavailability after contract award	Low	Medium	Name subs in proposal; availability confirmation; identify backup resources	PM
9	Public comment generates objections requiring significant revisions	Low-Med	Medium	Revision time in Task 7 schedule; change control process in PMP	PM · Regulatory
10	Competing bidder protests the award	Low	Medium	Document all examples and scoring; maintain proposal records; no off-channel contact	PM
11	Recycling commodity market changes invalidate analysis assumptions	Medium	Low-Med	Dated data snapshots with clear assumptions; update mechanism in Task 5.3	Circular Economy
12	Insurance carrier cannot name County as additional insured within 10-day window	Low	High	Confirm additional insured endorsement with broker pre-submission	PM · Admin

EGLE's pyramid *is the framework.*

The Bay County MMP is an environmental planning engagement at its core. The entire scope is driven by EGLE's **Sustainable Materials Management Pyramid**, which prioritises reduction and reuse over disposal. The strategy below is specific to this solicitation.

Environmental Compliance Framework

The plan must comply with Michigan PA 451, Part 115 (2023 amendments), which replaced the solid waste disposal focus with a materials management systems framework. § 324.11578 defines the content requirements for a compliant plan.

EGLE's Sustainable Materials Management Pyramid must be explicitly referenced and used as the organising framework for goals and objectives. Proposals showing familiarity with this specific framework (not generic sustainability frameworks) will score higher on scope understanding.

The Michigan **45% recycling rate goal by 2030** and **50% food waste reduction goal by 2030** are non-negotiable benchmarks. The plan must establish Bay County-specific targets that contribute to these state goals. Task 4.5 (Performance Metrics) and Task 2 (Baseline MSW recycling rate) are the mechanisms for this.

Environmental-justice communities must be addressed specifically. EGLE evaluates plans on equitable access to materials management services. The proposal should name Bay County's EJ communities (use EGLE's EJ screening tool data) and propose targeted engagement methods.

POSITIONING

*Winning bidders on EGLE-funded MMP engagements position themselves not as solid-waste consultants but as **circular-economy practitioners**. The language shift is intentional and EGLE-responsive. Proposals that use PA 451's own terminology (materials management, circular economy, sustainable materials management) throughout the approach section signal alignment with EGLE's regulatory philosophy. This is not marketing language; it reflects how the plan will be evaluated by EGLE for approval.*

Six moves *worth the bid.*

1 Name a Michigan-based PA 451 specialist by name.

The most direct way to dominate the 25-point experience factor is to show evaluators a team member who has guided a Michigan county through the exact EGLE plan approval process under the 2023 Act. A named individual with that credential is worth more than paragraphs of general experience.

2 Price to win, not to maximise margin.

The fee carries only 10 points, but a fee dramatically out of range signals poor scope understanding — damaging the 30-point Approach score. Build the fee from the actual task structure, justify every line, land at a figure that reflects the true complexity of a 12.5-month multi-stakeholder process.

3 Address the equity mandate directly and specifically.

Proposals that name specific engagement methods for disadvantaged communities (not generic “diverse stakeholders” language) will score higher on the 30-point approach criterion.

4 Demonstrate EGLE grant experience.

The consultant inherits the County’s EGLE grant reporting obligations. Prior EGLE grant management experience eliminates a significant project risk and should be named in the Firm Profile and approach sections.

5 Show the approval path, not just the deliverable list.

The Plan adoption process under § 324.11575 is a defined statutory sequence. The milestone work plan should show how the 60-day comment period, public hearing, Planning Committee recommendation, and Board adoption fit within the June 22, 2027 deadline.

6 Secure sub-consultants before submission.

A proposal that says “we will identify sub-consultants after award” signals risk. Named sub-consultants with resumes for legal/policy and community engagement functions demonstrate readiness.

DISCLOSURE

One engagement. *Internal use only.*

This Tender Insight consolidates BronzeKeel's strategic analysis of publicly-available RFP information for the named Prime's pursuit of RFP 2026-08. All analyst assessments are derived from the source RFP and BronzeKeel's published capture economics. Independently verify before bid submission. The information herein creates no contractual obligation, endorsement, or guarantee.

BronzeKeel is the operating brand of CloudUpload Technology LLC, a Wyoming-incorporated U.S. company. NAICS 541512 · 541611. Remote Service Provider · NDA-first · 5-year confidentiality · U.S. data residency.

BRONZEKEEL · BK-CS-2026-05 / C · ENGAGEMENT DETAILS DISCLOSED UNDER SIGNED
MUTUAL NDA