I. Approval of Previous Minutes – May 15, 2012
Kelly asked if there was any discussion of the May meeting minutes. None was forthcoming. Kelly called for a motion. Dave Sabala made a motion to approve the May 15 IDB minutes. Alex Palm seconded.

The minutes of the May 15, 2012 DCIDB meeting were unanimously approved with no changes.

II. Unfinished Business.
A. DCIDB Ordinance and Function (Kelly Morgan)
Kelly explained that, due to the current status of the IDB as an advisory group and the lack of items requiring input, he had chosen to cancel the meetings for June, July and August.

Kelly then opened the floor to discussion of the IDB's current role and powers.

Kelly stated his concern regarding the IDB having no power to act; they could only make recommendations to the Commissioners. His concern was that, often no action was taken on the recommendations and that the IDB would like to have more control. He said other members had expressed concerns that there were no actions taken on the recommendations or that the actions were not taken within a reasonable time.

He said that he felt there were the following choices regarding the direction of the IDB:
1. Leave it the way it is and remain an advisory board.
2. Request that the Commissioners return the IDB's authority to take certain actions.

Board members discussed their feelings regarding the current status and frustrations regarding the lack of follow up and action.

It was determined that IDB members wanted to clarify their role as either an strictly advisory committee that gives recommendations to the Commissioners, which may or may not be utilized; or as an advisory Board with the ability to move forward with their recommendations.

ACTION:
Tania was directed to set up meetings for IDB members Perry Murray, Alex Palm, Kelly Morgan and Ron Doan with each of the Commissioners, separately.

B. County Industrial Sites Improvements Status (Alex Campbell)
Please see attached land committee report and recommendations for detail.
Alex Campbell said the County was working on a land swap with ODOT for a one acre piece of property in South Umpqua Industrial Park. This is a necessary part of the plan for listing the SUIP property for sale.

The Sutherlin Spec building was discussed. The County has received a grant to do some site development. Alex said the building is in the budget, but there is little interest in going forward without a clear user for the building. He said there had been discussion about moving forward with a virtual building and getting as much done as possible, including permitting. Alex said that the Partnership had put together some information about virtual buildings and the associated costs and that he would be happy to make a presentation and give the estimated soft costs.

Jerry Gilliam expressed an interest in being able to include a virtual building on the Sutherlin Economic Development website.

It was determined that:
1. The project needed to have a final go/no go decision from the Commissioners, including whether to build a physical structure or proceed with a virtual building.
2. The project may better be served by continuing forward with a virtual building.
3. Alex Campbell was directed to develop a budget for a virtual building for presentation to the Commissioners and the IDB.

**ACTION:**
The consensus of the Board was to seek the Commissioners’ approval to go forward with the virtual building and present the budget for the virtual building for approval by the Commissioners.

Alex Campbell was directed to develop a virtual building budget to present to the Commissioners.

C. Realtor RFP (Paul Meyer)
Paul Meyer said that he had drafted an RFP and a service contract for the County to hire a realtor to list the County owned Industrial sites. It was determined that the realtor payment would include a flat fee for listing and a percentage of the sales price if the property sold. Paul said that Alex had met with the Land Sub Committee and consulted some realtors, which had resulted in some changes. The Land Subcommittee suggested going with a flat fee only. The Land Committees’ changes have been added to the draft. Paul said there were some minor housekeeping issues and he expected to have it ready in a day or two.

Discussion ensued. It was suggested that there be a provision for a 3.5% buyer’s broker commission to alleviate the remainder of the realtor concerns.

Kelly Morgan asked for a motion to send the RFP to the County Commissioners for approval with the administrative changes. Georgia Stiles so moved. Dave Sabala seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Alex Campbell volunteered to be the point person in the contract.

**ACTION:**
Forward the RFP to the County Commissioners for approval with the administrative changes.

Paul Meyer will make the administrative changes to the contract and include Alex Campbell as the point person in the contract.
IV. **New Business:**

A. **Recommendation for Resolution in Support of Coos Bay Project Mainstay**

Alex Campbell referred the members to the letter included in their packet. He explained that the Land Committee had reviewed both the letter and resolution and was in support.

Kelly said he would entertain a motion to make a recommendation to the County Commissioners to issue a Resolution in support of the Coos Bay Project Mainstay. Dave Sabala so moved. Lauren Young seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**ACTION:**

*Request Douglas County Commissioners issue a Resolution in support of Coos Bay Project Mainstay.*

B. **Letter in support of Pacific Connector & Jordan Cove**

Alex Campbell explained that some of the classification changes with the Pacific Connector & Jordan Cove issue had resulted in a new approval process. All former public comment had been wiped out. Alex said that the IDB had issued a letter of support for the project in 2009 and was requesting that the IDB issue a new letter of support for this approval round.

Dave Sabala mad a motion to approve the IDB issue of a letter of support for the Pacific Connector & Jordan Cove project and that the IDB also forward a recommendation to the Commissioners that they issue a letter of support. Georgia Stiles seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**ACTION:**

*Request Douglas County Commissioners issue a letter in support of the Pacific Connector & Jordan Cove project.*

**Tania will draft a letter of support for the IDB, obtain signature and forward.**

C. **Land for Job Incentive Standards**

Alex Campbell explained that the Land Committee had met to discuss the “land for jobs” incentive standards. It was determined that land for jobs should be defined as “total compensation including wages and benefits to be at least 150% of the current county average wage.” This would place the current standard at $51,075 which is also the current standard for the 5-year Enterprise Zone tax abatement qualification. There will be allowance to finesse the language for exemptions and the allowance would be $5,000 per qualifying job. Alex confirmed that this was the recommendation of the Land Committee.

There was discussion of possible inflation rate adjustments. It was determined that these adjustments would be done once a year. Tania was directed to remind the Land Committee to review this rate once a year and make a recommendation back annually.

Dave Sabala made a motion to adopt the Land Committees recommendation for the “Land for Jobs Incentive Standard” at the current $51,075 amount. Alex Palm seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

D. **Lead Generation Contract**

Alex Campbell explained that the Partnership Marketing Committee had been reviewing options for locating leads. He explained that UEDP had looked at several options and had reviewed the Chabin report to determine industries to target. The Partnership Marketing Committee has determined that they need to look at a new lead generation contract.
Alex said that the Partnership would be looking at a lead generation with industry focused leads. The main industry to be targeted is secondary wood products. Alex said they were looking at a contract with a potential full cost of $15-$20,000.

Alex explained that in the past the IDB had participated in funding the lead generation contract at a 50% level. He said the IDB Land Committee had reviewed the Partnership request for the IDB to again participate in the funding a lead generation contract. The Land Committee was recommending that the IDB participate in the contract by contributing up to $10,000 to the contract.

The IDB indicated interest in being involved in the contract selection process by having the Land Committee review and make recommendations.

Dave Sabala made a motion to ask the Commissioners to approve the IDB's expenditure of 50% of the cost of a lead generation contract up to a total of $10,000 with the Partnership; contract acceptance and participation to be reviewed by the Land committee for approval. Alex Palm seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**ACTION:**
Request Douglas County Commissioners approve the IDB's expenditure of 50% of the cost of a lead generation contract up to a total of $10,000.

V. Open Discussion
A. Port of Umpqua – Loan Status Update (Charmaine Vitek)
Charmaine Vitek explained that the Port of Umpqua has been working to reduce debt during the budget process. She explained that the IDB has been high on the list of those to pay down. The Port had approved the payoff of half of the existing balance of the loan. The payment of $23,800 has been made.
Kelly thanked Charmaine and the Port for their commitment to paying off the debt.

Dave Sabala said that there was work on a Broadband map for Oregon. He said that there would be an online map that he would like to see linked to as many of the economic development websites as possible.

VIII. Adjourn DCIDB Business Meeting

Respectfully submitted,

[Signatures]

Satania Korpi, Staff

Douglas County Industrial Development Board

Kelly Morgan, President
Attachment A

A recording of the meeting is available at the CCD office, 744 SE Rose, Roseburg, Oregon.

The following DCIDB members attended the meeting:
Lauren Young, Ron Doan, Alex Palm, Fred Jacquot, Dave Sabala, Kelly Morgan, Perry Murray, Georgia Stiles

The following DCIDB Ex-officio members attended the meeting:
Rob Paul, Aaron Cubic, Carl Patenode, Charmaine Vitek, Patricia Klassen, Brian Davidson, Jerry Gillham

County Representatives:
Richard Arrow, Douglas County CFO

Staff:
Satania Korpi, CCD Staff

Ad Hoc Committee Members:
Alex Campbell, Cindy Kent

Guests:
Annette Shelton-Tiderman, OED Research; Melony Hakola, G. Stiles Realty; Dave Kaiser, Dave Kaiser Enterprises; Kay Huff, Green Sanitary District; Vicki Howren, Tri City Water/Sanitary; Alan Paulson Roberts Creek Water Distirct
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## Industrial Park Issues

### Bolon Island

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bolon Island Pre-Development Assessment</th>
<th>Work items: 1. Order title report and review all existing easements. 2. ID location for existing on-site pressurized sewer line. Prepare &amp; record easement, if necessary. 3. Develop an exhibit showing all easements on the property, with wetlands and other setbacks. 4. Document all access restrictions related to IP short line and ODOT highway. 4. Resolve/document resolution of spoils issue. 5. Clarify status of park usage.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RR Crossing Transfer</td>
<td>DCPW is awaiting resolution of crossing status before moving forward with site feasibility study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graving Dock</td>
<td>Status: Recent action by American Bridge (May 2012) to accept their crossing, should clear the way for IP to complete action and clear up RR crossing issues. IP communicated Sept 2012, they will be sending signed modifications of the easement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Creek</td>
<td>On uplands, no clean-up is required, will need cap and maintenance plan. County will not terminate their lease until Knife River complies with those issues (still a few years left on lease). In addition, will need to complete below water investigation (samples were taken through dock and awaiting test results as of Sept. 12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland delin.</td>
<td>Re-delineation is complete. Was submitted to DSL for approval Sept. 2012. Likely approval period 90+ days.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### South Umpqua IP

| Solicit realtor to represent South Umpqua | IDB Land Subcommittee requested feedback from 3 local realtors and provided suggested edits to the County attorney. |
| South Umpqua Industrial Park Clean-up    | Blackberry has been mowed. Need to follow-up and spray blackberry summer & fall. |
| South Umpqua Industrial Park ODOT parcel purchase | Robb Paul has issued letter to Steve Eck at ODOT requesting purchase, requesting ODOT initiate process of declaring property surplus. Susan and others have spoken with ODOT, still not yet declared surplus. |
| Alpha Leisure                           | Alex Campbell contacted Johnnie Crean to feel out his position. Responded he is likely to exercise option and make balloon payment this year. |
|                                           | AC contacted JC to see if he would simply walk away from 14 acre first right of refusal. |
|                                           | Answer was no. Still representing that he is likely to make balloon payment toward end of this year/early next year. Preference will be to do build-to-suit and lease. |
| Land value /appraisal.                   | DCPW is going to have Right of Way Associates appraise the SUIP 5 acre site. |

March 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sutherlin IP</th>
<th>Spec Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The preliminary layouts are complete and have been forwarded to land committee. Preliminary layouts are being completed in conjunction with the Site Plan Development. A One-Call Utility locate has been completed and the site was surveyed once the utilities where marked. A Base Map has been completed from the topo survey including existing the utilities as marked. Offsite Water Line Plans – Preliminary waterline alignment has been completed and construction plans will be developed. Still working on conceptual plan for roadway and other utilities Sept. 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key question for moving forward with the project will be defining envelope in which to deal with wetland issues, i.e., whole parcel or spec site only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Delin.</td>
<td>DSL has refused to extend wetland delineation. Field work for re-delineation was completed late spring 2012. Mapping underway, should submit this month (Sept. 2012).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilbur/Winchester</th>
<th>McFarland/Cascade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re-delineation is complete. DSL did not view new information as adequate to support any substantial change in &quot;wetland&quot; area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Department is investigating possible mitigation strategy using some new land acquisition that could support McF/Cascade’s planned development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McF/Cascade has added new employees. Will double-stack, raising production cost, in anticipation of purchase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local engineering firm is working under contract with the County to develop a cost estimate for what the likely mitigation would be for McF/Cascade’s envisioned expansion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Issues</th>
<th>Make a buyer's broker commission available.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Partnership was given OK to use similar language to land department in advertising Sunrise property-i.e., 3.5% buyer's broker commission available. COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCC Truck Driving</td>
<td>IDB contribution is in County budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Foundation is funding scholarships in the interim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Umpqua bank is working through approval of loan process/fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RFP (Allyn Ford) is interested in help coalesce local corporate contributions to loan fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 766</td>
<td>Partnership nominated Back Nine, SIP, and Stearns Lane as the Central Douglas RSIA. State committee vote is scheduled for Sept. 28.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

March 2012
Notes

1. **Realtor RFP for listing S. Umpqua IP**

Land sub-committee recommendations:

A flat fee for the commission resolves a number of questions raised by “Land for Jobs” discounts, non-cash purchase, etc. Suggest realtors are required to simply propose a flat fee for services, payable upon sale, per listing. (This would simplify and eliminate most of the language from item 2, Exhibit 1 to Realtor Listing Services Contract.)

To minimize burden on applicant & encourage more applications, suggest establishing maximum proposal response of 1 page (i.e. narrative response to Qualifications, Project Approach, and Fee Proposal, should be no more than 1 page). (Similarly, reference request is probably excessive. A minimum of 5 references should be sufficient, rather than all clients in previous two years.)

County may wish to require a realtor carry errors and omissions insurance from a reputable insurance carrier [check box 6.1.3 on contract]

Evaluation criteria seem unnecessarily complex...

Suggest:
1. Demonstrated successful experience listing and selling commercial and industrial property.
2. Proposed approach
3. Price
4. Knowledge of local and regional industrial land markets

**Recommendations should be directed to Paul Meyer**

2. **Secure a current appraisal for S. Umpqua IP**

Recommend securing appraisal of one site. Recommendation should go directly to Commissioner Morgan.

3. **Land for Jobs incentive**

Recommend defining a family wage job at the Enterprise Zone standard. (Total compensation, wages and benefits, at least 150% of current county average wage. Most recent available county average wage is $34,050, so 150%=$51,075. This is the standard for the 5-year Enterprise Zone.) Language should leave wiggle room for negotiations in case business is close to threshold and/or extenuating circumstances

Recommendation should go to IDB as a whole.

4. **International Paper site-focused lead generation effort**

Recommend pursuing grant funds to pursue IP effort.

5. **Partnership-led secondary wood products lead generation effort**

Recommend supporting Partnership lead generation efforts.

6. **Open discussion**

Discussed potential for moving forward with spec project in Sutherlin, either as virtual project or joint venture with private developer. **Request update on effort from Robb Paul at next IDB meeting.**
May 29, 2009

Douglas County Commissioners
Douglas County Courthouse
Roseburg, OR 97470

Dear Commissioners:

At its May 19th meeting, the Douglas County Industrial Development Board unanimously approved a resolution of support for the Jordan Cove Energy and the Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline.

We think the economic development values of the project are self-evident. Of course, we are concerned with the on-going issues of environmental safety and fairness to property owners.

We see the need for natural gas in many industrial applications and we want to make sure that we have reliable, cost effective, and sustainable supplies of natural gas for existing employers and prospective companies that might be interested in locating here.

Sincerely,

Norm Gershon
President
DOUGLAS COUNTY
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
FOR
REALTOR LISTING SERVICES
RFP NO. _____

SUBMITTAL DEADLINE: 2:00 P.M., ____________, 2012
DOUGLAS COUNTY
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS REALTOR LISTING SERVICES

RFP NO. _____

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, the Douglas County Industrial Development Board ("DCIDB" or "Douglas County" or "County") is requesting sealed proposals from qualified persons to market and sell industrial real property owned by Douglas County. Interested parties will be provided sufficient information to prepare and submit proposals for consideration by the County. It is the County's intent to select the most advantageous proposal based on the evaluation criteria set forth in the Request for Proposals ("RFP") packet. A copy of the RFP packet may be obtained from the __________, at ________, ____________, Roseburg, OR 97470.

All proposals must be sealed, clearly marked "Realtor Listing Proposal - RFP No. _____, 2:00 p.m., _________, 2012 and received in the __________ at _________ by the above specified date and time. Any proposal received after that date and time, or not submitted in the proper manner, will be returned without further consideration.

The County reserves the right to reject any and all proposals received as a result of this RFP, to waive any irregularities and to accept the proposal deemed to be in the best interest of the County. Preparation and submission of a proposal is at the proposer's sole risk and expense.
DOUGLAS COUNTY REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR
REALTOR LISTING SERVICES

RFP NO. _____

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS AND INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPOSERS

1. GENERAL INFORMATION. These general requirements and instructions have been written to describe the services more particularly described in the Request for Proposals ("RFP") Exhibit "B" for the listing, marketing, and sale of real property owned by Douglas County and the Douglas County Industrial Development Board ("DCIDB" or "County").

The successful proposer will be expected to enter into one or more listing contracts as described in Exhibit "B". The DCIDB expects to initially enter into only one listing contract for one parcel of industrial land. Depending on the success of that first attempt, the DCIDB may be willing, but will not be required, to enter into additional listing contracts with the successful proposer for additional parcels of industrial land.

This RFP is intended to provide interested persons (herein referred to as "proposers") with sufficient information to prepare and submit proposals for consideration by the County. It is the County's intent to select the most advantageous proposal based on the evaluation criteria set forth in this RFP.

The County reserves the right to reject any and all proposals received as a result of this RFP prior to the execution of a contract upon a finding that it is in the public interest to do so. Preparation and submission of a proposal is at the proposer's sole risk and expense.

Proposals and all accompanying documents will become the property of the County and will not be returned. See Section 16 of this RFP, entitled "Public Records".

This RFP contains and incorporates the following:

- Exhibit "A" Proposal Form
- Exhibit "B" Realtor Listing Contract (draft)
- Exhibit "C" Minimum Qualifications
- Exhibit "D" Evaluation Criteria

2. FORM OF PROPOSAL. Proposals are to be based on and submitted in accordance with the instructions contained in this RFP. The County may change these instructions at any time prior to the Solicitation Closing by addendum as provided in Section 6 of this RFP. Proposers are responsible for responding to all addenda.
3. **POINT OF CONTACT.** __________ is the point of contact in the County for this RFP. All correspondence pertaining to this RFP should be directed to __________, ____________, Roseburg, OR 97470.

4. **TECHNICAL CLARIFICATIONS, REQUESTS FOR CHANGES.** Questions regarding specific technical aspects of the services requested by this RFP or seeking clarification concerning this RFP may be directed to __________ by calling 541-_______. No oral clarification will be binding on the County. The County will be bound only by this RFP and any written addendum issued hereunder.

Requests for changes to this RFP, including requests for changes in any of the exhibits to this RFP must be submitted in writing to the County not later than ten calendar days prior to the date of the Solicitation Closing. The request must include a statement of the requested changes and the reason therefore. The request shall be marked as a "Request of Change in RFP" and specify the RFP Number set forth in the caption to this RFP. The County will respond to all written requests for changes, in writing, within five days of receipt of such request.

If inquiries, comments or requests for changes raise issues that require clarification or a modification to this RFP, the clarification or modification will be made by written addendum as provided in Section 6 of this RFP.

5. **SCHEDULE OF EVENTS.** The following schedule of events shall be followed for this RFP. Proposers are strongly encouraged to attend the RFP conference, if scheduled. If no date is shown below, then the event is not scheduled for this RFP. Failure to attend a Mandatory RFP Conference may result in proposal rejection.

- **Solicitation Starting Date**
- **Solicitation Closing** 2:00 p.m., __________, 2012
- **Initial Proposal Review Period** Week of __________, 2012
- **Interviews if Needed** __________, 2012
- **Notice of Intent to Award** __________, 2012
- **Award and Execution of Contract** __________, 2012

If the County receives a request for change or protest from a proposer in accordance with the instructions in this RFP, the County may extend the Solicitation Closing date as necessary to consider whether to issue an addendum. The County also reserves the right to delay any of the dates set forth above, if it is determined to be in the best public interest to do so. The addendum shall become effective upon execution by the County.

6. **ADDENDUM TO THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS.** In the event it becomes necessary to revise any part of this RFP prior to the Solicitation Closing, an addendum will be provided to all proposers who have requested and received a copy of this RFP. RECEIPT OF AN ADDENDUM MUST BE ACKNOWLEDGED BY SIGNING AND RETURNING THE DOCUMENT WITH THE PROPOSAL. Proposers may protest requirements of this RFP by submitting a request for change, in accordance with
Section 4 of this RFP. No addendum will be issued less than four days prior to the date of the Solicitation Closing.

7. **FORMAT OF PROPOSALS.** Proposals must contain the information specified in Section 8 of this RFP. Proposals must be prepared on the proposal form attached hereto as RFP Exhibit "A." A proposal should provide a concise description of the proposer's ability to satisfy the requirement of this RFP and the contract attached hereto as Exhibit "B."

8. **CONTENT OF PROPOSALS.** Proposals should demonstrate that the proposer can furnish the services in a manner that will be cost effective for the County. Those proposals which do not contain all information required by this RFP or are otherwise non-responsive may be rejected immediately; however the County has discretion to accept a proposal that does not conform with all RFP requirements if the County determines that the non-conformance is not substantial or material. If a proposal is unclear, or appears inadequate, at the County's discretion, the proposer may be given an opportunity to explain how the proposal complies with the RFP. The County also has discretion to permit a proposer to correct a typographical error or other minor mistake or oversight in its proposal.

8.1. Proposals must contain at least the following:

8.1.1 **Proposal Form.** The proposal form, attached hereto as RFP Exhibit "A" must be fully completed, submitted and duly executed by the authorized representative of the proposer, and include the following:

a. The proposer's business name, address, telephone number, e-mail address and federal taxpayer identification number;

b. The proposer's legal form of entity (sole proprietor, corporation, LLC, etc.) and, if applicable, state of incorporation or organization and main office address;

c. Name(s) and title(s) of person(s) authorized to submit the proposal and to execute the contract; and

d. The estimated listing fee and sales commission the proposer anticipates charging the County for the services request.

8.1.2 **Qualifications.** The proposer's statement of qualifications must contain the following:

a. A description of the key personnel that will perform the services and their particular qualifications;
b. A description of how proposer complies with all minimum qualifications set forth in RFP Exhibit "C";

c. Special services the proposer can provide in connection with the services required by this RFP and as described in RFP Exhibit "B";and

d. Any experience proposer has had in providing the services required by this RFP to the County or other public entities.

e. A full description of the proposer’s marketing plan and how the properties would be advertised.

8.1.2 Maximum Proposal Length. Proposals may include no more than one (1) additional page to provide detailed responses to the items on the proposal form.

8.1.3 References. Proposals must contain a list of all at least five private and public entities for which the proposer has provided similar services within the past two years and the name and phone number of a person within each entity who is knowledgeable of the proposer’s performance record. This information may be furnished on an additional page.

9. EXECUTION OF CONTRACT. The proposer selected by the County to provide the requested services will be expected to enter into a written contract in the form attached hereto as RFP Exhibit “B”.

BY SUBMITTING ITS PROPOSAL, THE PROPOSER CERTIFIES THAT IT HAS READ AND ACCEPTS ALL TERMS, CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS OF THIS RFP, INCLUDING THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE FORM OF CONTRACT IN RFP EXHIBIT “B”, AND THAT IF PROPOSER REFUSES TO EXECUTE THE CONTRACT AFTER AWARD, THE COUNTY WILL BE ENTITLED TO SEEK COMPENSATION FOR ITS DAMAGES, WHICH MAY INCLUDE THE COST OF CONDUCTING A NEW SOLICITATION.

10. DELIVERY OF PROPOSALS. In order to be considered, three copies of the sealed proposals must arrive at _______ before the time and date of the Solicitation Closing as described in this RFP. Proposers who mail proposals should allow extra mail delivery time to insure timely receipt of their proposals. Proposals received after the Solicitation Closing will not be considered and will be returned unopened to the proposer. Proposals must be submitted in sealed envelopes clearly marked with the RFP number shown in the caption of this RFP and the time and date of the Solicitation Closing.
11. Submission and Withdrawal of Proposals. Proposers may modify or withdraw their proposals at any time prior to the Solicitation Closing by providing a written request for modification or withdrawal to _________. Requests for withdrawal of proposals will not be accepted after the Solicitation Closing. A proposer may also withdraw its proposal in person prior to the Solicitation Closing, upon presentation of appropriate identification and satisfactory evidence of authority _________. ________ shall obtain the signature of the person making the withdrawal.

ALL PROPOSALS SHALL BE IRREVOCABLE FOR A PERIOD OF 60 DAYS FROM THE SOLICITATION CLOSING.

12. Opening of Proposals. Proposals received in response to this RFP will be opened by ________ or designee, immediately after the Solicitation Closing in room ______ of the County Courthouse located in Roseburg, Oregon. The names and addresses of all proposers will be announced and recorded by the County. No other information will be made available at that time.

13. Minimum Qualifications Required. Proposals must indicate how the proposer satisfies the minimum qualifications set forth in RFP Exhibit "C".

14. Evaluation of Proposals. The County will evaluate the proposals according to the evaluation criteria and rating scheme set forth in RFP Exhibit "D" and in accordance with the following:

14.1 Interviews. The County may require interviews with all responsive proposers regardless of the interview schedule in Section 5 of this RFP. In addition, the County may request an interview with one or more proposers, if the County determines that an interview would help the County better evaluate the proposal.

14.2 Negotiation. At the conclusion of the rated criteria evaluation process and prior to selection, the County may, but shall not be required to, negotiate with the proposer who has the highest criteria ratings. The County may only negotiate an alternative term or condition submitted by a proposer if the alternative term or condition is reasonably related to a term or condition that this RFP describes as negotiable.

14.2.1 The matters subject to negotiation shall be limited to the following:

a. Price, however, the County may not negotiate a contract price less favorable to the County than the minimum acceptable proposal as stated in this RFP or an addendum issued prior to the solicitation closing date;

b. Other terms and provisions that the County would like to change.
14.2.2 Nothing in this RFP shall restrict or prohibit the County from canceling the solicitation at any time. At any time during the negotiations, the County may:

a. terminate negotiations with particular proposers; or

b. reject all proposals and cancel the solicitation.

If the contract is to be awarded based on the negotiations, the County shall provide written notice of intent to award the Contract. An unsuccessful proposer may protest the County’s evaluation and determination of the award as provided in Section 18.5 of this RFP.

14.3 Evaluation Record. A record will be made of all criteria evaluation ratings and all other grounds upon which a proposer is selected.

15. SELECTION PROCESS AND NOTICE OF AWARD. The County will select the proposal deemed most beneficial to the County based on its evaluation of the proposals by a selection committee of no fewer than two individuals. The apparent successful proposer and all other persons who submitted proposals will be notified of the County’s selection. Unless award of a contract is delayed by the County, written notice of award, specifying the date of selection, will be made within a reasonable time after the date of selection. Final award will depend upon the execution of an acceptable contract and may be withdrawn by the County at any time prior to execution of the contract by the County.

16. PUBLIC RECORDS. This RFP and each original proposal received in response to it, together with copies of documents pertaining to the award of a contract shall be kept on file as a public record by the County; provided, however, such records shall not be disclosed until after the Notice of Intent to Award the resulting contract has been issued.

17. RECORDS REVIEW; CONFIDENTIALITY. After Notice of Intent to Award the resulting contract has been issued, all proposals shall be available for public inspection except for those portions of a proposal that the proposer designates in its proposal as trade secrets or as confidential proprietary data in accordance with applicable state law. If the County determines such designation is not in accordance with applicable law, the County shall make those portions available for public inspection. The proposer shall separate information designated as confidential from other non-confidential information at the time of submitting its proposal. Prices and terms of payment are not confidential, and shall be publically available regardless of a proposer’s designation to the contrary.

18. PROTEST OF PROPOSER SELECTION, CONTRACT AWARD.
18.1 Purpose. An adversely affected or aggrieved proposer must exhaust all avenues of administrative review and relief before seeking judicial review of the County's selection of a proposer or contract award decision.

18.2 The County shall not consider a protest submitted after the time period provided in this RFP.

18.3 Notice of Intent to Award Contract. The County will provide written notice to all proposers of the County’s intent to award the contract. The County's award shall not be final until the later of the following:

   a. seven days after the date on which the notice is mailed or otherwise transmitted; or
   b. The County provides a written response to all timely-filed protests that denies the protest and affirms the award.

18.4 Right to Protest Award.

18.4.1 An adversely affected or aggrieved proposer may submit to the County a written protest of the County's intent to award within seven days after issuance of the notice of intent to award the Contract.

18.4.2 The proposer's protest shall be in writing and must specify the grounds upon which the protest is based.

18.4.3 A proposer is adversely affected or aggrieved only if the proposer is eligible for award of the Contract as the responsible proposer submitting the best responsive proposal and is next in line for award, i.e., the protesting proposer must claim that all higher-scored proposers are ineligible for award:

   a. because their proposals were non-responsive; or
   b. the County committed a substantial violation of a provision in the RFP or of an applicable procurement statute or administrative rule, and the protestor was unfairly evaluated and would have, but for such substantial violation, been the responsible proposer offering the highest-ranked proposal.

18.4.4 The County shall not consider a protest submitted after the time period provided in this RFP.

18.5 Authority to Resolve Protests. has the authority to settle or resolve a written protest submitted in accordance with the requirements of this rule.
18.6 Decision. If a protest is not settled, __________ or designee shall promptly issue a written decision on the protest. Judicial review of this decision will be available if provided by statute.
EXHIBIT “A”
RFP NO. ______

PROPOSAL FORM

Legal Business Name: ________________________________
Form and State of Organization: _________________________
Registered dba, if any: _________________________________
Main Office Address: __________________________________
Telephone Number: _______ E-Mail: ________________
Tax Identification Number: _____________________________

Representation, Covenant and Warranty of Undersigned and Proposer

By signing this proposal, the undersigned makes the following representations and warranties:

1. That it is the duly authorized representative of the proposer for all purposes relative to the submission of this proposal.

2. That this proposal constitutes the proposer’s offer to enter into a contract with the County and, if accepted by the County, will binding and enforceable against the proposer.

By causing this proposal to be executed by the undersigned and delivered to the County, the proposer makes the following representations and warranties:

1. Proposer has read and understands the terms and conditions contained in the RFP, it has had the opportunity to protest any term or condition that it finds unacceptable and to seek clarification of any term or condition that it does not understand, and it accepts and agrees to be bound by the terms and conditions of the RFP, including, but not limited to the contract conditions.

2. Proposer has not discriminated against minority, women, disabled veterans or emerging small business enterprises in obtaining any required subcontracts.

3. Proposer has not been listed by the Oregon Contractor's Board or the Oregon Department of Administrative Services as a person disqualified or ineligible to bid on or perform work under public contracts.

4. Proposer agrees to meet all requirements contained in the RFP if it is selected to provide the services requested by this RFP.
PROPOSAL FORM (continued)

5. Proposer meets all of the minimum qualifications listed on Exhibit C.

PROPOSAL FORM (continued)

Qualifications: In addition to the information requested by Section 8 of this RFP, the proposer should describe its particular capability to perform the services required under this RFP, and its recent, current and projected workloads.

Project Approach: Proposer should propose a project approach, including an estimate of the amount of time that it will need to complete each major task and a preliminary schedule for performing major elements. Describe any subcontractors that proposer would use as consultants and how the subcontractors would be used. Describe any special resources and equipment.

Fee Proposal: Proposer hereby offers to perform the services described in the RFP according to the fee structure described below. The fee structure should include all charges that the proposer will require:

Flat Fee Listing Fee: $_____.

The listing fee would apply to one property and would be payable only upon sale of the listed property. Sale Commission: _____% of sales price.
Authorized Signature: 
Print Name and Title: 
Date of Signature: 
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EXHIBIT “B”  
[attach draft listing contract]
EXHIBIT "C"
RFP NO. _____

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

Proposer must:

- be licensed pursuant to state law;
- not be disqualified by the Department of Administrative Services or the State Contractor's Board from working on public contracts;
- be an Oregon licensed realtor or broker;
- have the financial and personnel resources for the performance of the contract;
- have an adequate past record of performance, verifiable through references;
- be able to meet the contract provisions;
- be able to list property on the Roseburg Multiple Listing Service; and
- have a demonstrated experience of at least five years listing and successfully selling industrial and/or commercial property.

Note: FAILURE TO MEET THE FOREGOING MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS OR OTHER REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH IN THIS RFP SHALL CONSTITUTE A SUBSTANTIAL NON-CONFORMANCE AND WILL EXCLUDE FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSAL.
EXHIBIT "D"
RFP NO. _____

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Responsive proposals will be evaluated under the criteria set forth below. For each
criterion, the proposal will receive a number of points within the available range for that
criterion. Unless negotiations are conducted as provided in Section 14 of the RFP, the
contract will be awarded to the proposer with the highest overall score.

1. Proposal Substantially Complies with all RFP requirements.
   Yes____ No____ If No, indicate the manner in which the proposal is non-
   conforming. Non-conforming proposals will not be considered for award:

2. Availability/capability to perform the work. Demonstrated successful experience
   listing and selling commercial and/or industrial property

3. Interview/understanding of the County’s requirements, as shown by
   its approach to the project’s staffing and scheduling needs, proposed
   approach and discussion, and proposed solution of any unusual
   project conditions or requirements. Proposed approach

4. Cost to County

5. References/experience of proposer

6. Key personnel and their experience on similar projects with public agencies

7. Demonstrated ability to complete projects timely/successfully

8. Knowledge of local and regional industrial real estate market

Total Points = 
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Douglas County Oregon Board of Commissioners
Douglas County Courthouse – 1036 SE Douglas Avenue, Room 217
Roseburg, OR 97470

Re: Proposed Resolution Supporting the Coos Bay Rail Link

Dear Douglas County Commissioners Joseph Laurance, Susan Morgan and Doug Robertson:

I am writing to you on behalf of the Oregon International Port of Coos Bay, which owns the Coos Bay rail line and contracts for freight rail operations as the Coos Bay Rail Link. As you know, the Coos Bay Rail Link connects businesses and industries located in the southwestern Oregon communities of Coquille, Coos Bay, North Bend, Hauser, Reedsport, Gardiner, Mapleton, Noti, Veneta, and west Eugene to the Class 1 rail network that passes through Eugene. The Coos Bay Rail Link is a vital component of the transportation infrastructure that supports thousands of jobs in western Lane, western Douglas and Coos counties.

**Coos Bay Rail Link**

Just five short years ago, the former operator of the Coos Bay rail line terminated freight rail service on the line with 24-hours notice, claiming there was insufficient traffic on the rail line to support the ongoing maintenance needs of the infrastructure. Overnight, thousands of southwestern Oregon jobs were placed at risk, as employers scrambled to shift their inbound and outbound cargos onto trucks at significant additional cost. Working with Douglas County and our other regional partners, the Port took action to purchase, rehabilitate and re-open the rail line, not just to support jobs in Coos Bay, but to support jobs in Eugene and Coquille, Reedsport and Noti, and all along the rail line.

Since the rail line re-opened in October 2011 as the Coos Bay Rail Link, we have transported 1,185 railcars with cargo that would have otherwise been transported by at least 4,150 trucks operating on our community highways and roads. We have transported finished wood products originating from mills in western Lane and Coos counties. We have transported organic feed from the Midwest to support the burgeoning organic dairy industry in the Coquille Valley. We have transported project cargo to and from the American Bridge Manufacturing facility in Reedsport. In short, the use of the Coos Bay Rail Link for freight has supported jobs not only in Coos Bay, but in every community along the rail line from Eugene to Coquille.

The re-opening of the rail line has also supported the State of Oregon’s goals to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and improve overall regional air quality. Rail transportation of appropriate freight commodities results in 34% less carbon dioxide emissions, 27% less hydrocarbon emissions, and 82% less nitrous oxide emissions, than transportation of the same commodities by truck. As a result, since October 2011, the Coos Bay Rail Link has kept 158
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Phone: 541 267-7678 / Fax: 541 269-1475 / email: portcoos@portofcoosbay.com / Web: www.portofcoosbay.com
tons of carbon dioxide, 52 tons of hydrocarbons, and 152 tons of nitrous oxides out of the atmosphere. It has also reduced wear and tear on our community highways and roads, and improved the safety of the public travelling on those roads.

For all of its advantages, the Coos Bay rail line is also a very challenging piece of infrastructure to maintain, as it is comprised of 135 miles of rail that passes through 9 tunnels and over 150 bridges and other water crossings. Thanks to the support of State and Federal grants, the Port is currently investing $30 million rehabilitating the rail line. However, a recently completed study indicates that an additional $60 million to $75 million in repairs will be needed to meet deferred maintenance needs and keep the rail line operational past the 2018 to 2020 time period. Optimistic traffic projections from existing industries may generate enough revenue to cover only 3% of that amount. At the same time, State and Federal funding for transportation projects is under increasing pressure from budget cuts and increasing statewide and national needs. The Port's recent attempts to secure Federal funding through the TIGER program have been unsuccessful, and it is increasingly unlikely that government funding will be available to keep the rail line open in the future. As a result, it is essential that the Port, the Coos Bay Rail Link, and our regional economic development and transportation planning partners work together to secure private investment in the rail line.

Project Mainstay

The Coos Bay Bulk Terminal (aka Project Mainstay) is still just a concept, but it represents just such an opportunity to infuse much needed private capital into repairing and upgrading the capacity of the Coos Bay rail line. While it remains possible that, before the end of the year, the proponents of the project may decide not to pursue the development of the terminal, if a decision is made to proceed with the project, permit applications would likely be submitted during the summer of 2013.

The Port is currently working under an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement with a partnership of three companies that are evaluating the feasibility of developing a terminal in Coos Bay: Mitsui U.S.A (Mitsui), Metro Ports (Metro), and Korean Electric Power Company (KEPCO). The concept under development would involve the export of both Powder River Basin coal and southwestern Oregon produced industrial wood pellets (biomass) to a new state of the art energy production facility in South Korea that is currently under construction and scheduled to open in 2017. The Korean facility, which incorporates elements of wind, wave, solar, and thermal energy production, also includes a new research facility dedicated to the development of GHG emissions reduction technology; frankly, the Korean facility is nothing short of remarkable.

I have enclosed an Economic Impact Analysis for the project, which details the local, State and National economic impacts of the Coos Bay facility. The development of the Bulk Terminal will generate an approximate $200 million to $250 million investment in marine facilities, $150 million to $200 million investment in the Coos Bay rail line, and $100 million to $150 million investment in navigation channel improvements. Construction of the marine facilities and rail improvements alone are projected to result in nearly 2,600 jobs in Oregon, generating more than $140 million in personal income, including more than 1,400 jobs in Coos County generating more than $80
million in personal income. Operation of the Bulk Terminal is projected to result in more than
544 permanent jobs in Oregon, generating annual personal incomes in excess of $35 million,
including 285 permanent jobs in Coos County with personal income exceeding $24 million.

As part of our negotiations with the Project Mainstay partners, the Port parties have agreed that
the Port will assess a fee of $20 on every unit train rail car that will be used to fund Community
Sustainability Projects in every community located along the Coos Bay rail line. At full build-out,
the fee could generate well over $1.5 million annually to fund community health, education, and
conservation efforts. Such projects would be tailored to meet the greatest needs of each
community along the line, and each community would be invited to participate in the project
selection process.

While the Coos Bay Bulk Terminal project has significant potential to create jobs in the
southwest Oregon region and improve and sustain critical transportation infrastructure important
to the traded-sector economy of Oregon, the Port is not looking at this project as “jobs at any
cost.” The Port’s efforts are driven by the very critical need that business and industry in
southwest Oregon have access to competitive transportation options for the movement of goods,
and that in order for the Coos Bay Rail Link to remain viable, the Port must explore every
opportunity to increase freight rail traffic on the line. At the same time, we are looking at every
opportunity to leverage this project in ways that benefit other regional goals, including community
enhancement efforts and cargo diversification of the Coos Bay harbor.

Regulatory Oversight

If any type of unit train traffic were to begin moving via the Coos Bay Rail Link and a connecting
Class 1 or shortline railroad, it will be the responsibility of the commodity shipper to ensure
compliance with all applicable federal and state environmental requirements. In addition, the
Port has informed the Project Mainstay partners that environmental protection must be a primary
consideration in project planning, and that rail transport on the Coos Bay Rail Link will require the
use of the best reasonably available technologies to prevent fugitive dust emissions and protect
the environment and the residents of the region.

If and when any conceptual project reaches a point where the Port enters into an agreement with
a prospective developer and the permitting process is initiated for terminal development, rail line
capacity improvements, or both, there will be public comment periods associated with the
various permitting processes and protocols. The permitting processes will provide extensive
information about the scope and nature of specific developments, and the public comment
periods will allow all interested parties the opportunity to comment on the specifics of the permit
requirements. In addition, the Port is committed to holding public information sessions in all
communities along the Coos Bay rail line to better inform the public about the project.

Any terminal developer will be required to meet all applicable environmental regulations – state
and federal – related to the construction and operation of a marine cargo facility. Additionally,
the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has adopted emission standards for railroad
locomotives, both road engines and switchers. The phasing in of standards will continue to
tighten requirements for new equipment as well as remanufactured units. Tier 0-2 standards were adopted in December 1997, and became effective starting in 2000. Information about the Tier 0-2 protocols is available at 63 FR 18997-19084 / 16 April 1998. Tier 3-4 standards were introduced in March 2008 and dictate more stringent emission requirements, which became effective during 2015. Information about the Tier 3-4 protocols is available at 73 FR 88 25098-25352 / 6 May 2008. The two citations listed are from the Federal Register, which is available online. Locomotives used on the Coos Bay rail line will comply with all applicable diesel emission control standards.

Next Steps

Please consider the high levels of unemployment and underemployment throughout our region, as well as the struggles of our local governments to fund basic health, education, and public safety services, before taking a position on the Coos Bay Bulk Terminal Project. Simply accepting the assertions of project opponents rather than performing thorough due diligence does not lend itself to the creation of sound public policy for any organization. If you do decide to pass a resolution concerning the Coos Bay Bulk Terminal project, I would urge you to consider passing the enclosed resolution that we have drafted for your consideration.

The Oregon International Port of Coos Bay is committed to providing all applicable information about conceptual projects as is legally permissible. In addition, we are committed to a policy of full disclosure regarding marine industrial and transportation infrastructure projects that have moved beyond the conceptual phase as viable projects.

The Port considers Douglas County to be an important economic development partner in identifying and recruiting new businesses and industries to our region, as well as being an important transportation planning partner to ensure that our region has sufficient transportation infrastructure to meet the needs of our communities. The Port is available to brief you on the Bulk Terminal project, or any other Port project, and to answer any questions that you might have. We look forward to continuing our work with you to improve the economic and social condition of southwestern Oregon.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David R. Koch
Chief Executive Officer
Oregon International Port of Coos Bay

Cc: Coos County Oregon
City of Reedsport, Oregon
City of Veneta, Oregon
City of Lakeside, Oregon
City of Coos Bay, Oregon

Lane County Oregon
City of Eugene, Oregon
City of Florence, Oregon
City of North Bend, Oregon
City of Coquille, Oregon