

Attachment A

November, 3, 2009

POLICY TOPIC	POLICY ISSUES	OPTIONS	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
<p>RFP Scope of Services – Transfer Station Operations Transportation of Solid Waste Disposal of Solid Waste</p>	<p>Will the Board award one contract for all services?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Require one contractor for all services 2. Allow for separate contracts in each service area 3. Allow for various service combinations (e.g., operations with transport, transport with disposal, etc.) 	<p>Allow for various service combinations, however, to control administrative costs, it should result in no more than one contractor operating the transfer stations and one contractor hauling waste from the transfer stations to the disposal site or site(s). There may be multiple disposal site contracts.</p>
	<p>Will the Board contract out the operation of the Central Disposal Site Transfer Station currently run by county staff?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Board could direct staff <u>not to</u> include in the RFP work functions currently performed by county staff 2. Board could include in the RFP all transfer station operations functions 3. Board could direct staff to request separate pricing for operation of the Central Transfer Station so that a cost comparison can be prepared as a basis for a decision to contract out or not. 	<p>Staff recommends Option 1. To retain existing county run operations. Given the short-term and transitional nature of the contract(s) and that a final long-term strategy for solid waste is yet to be determined, staff does not see a benefit to further privatizing the operation.</p>
<p><u>Contract Extensions or RFP - Length of Term</u></p>	<p>What should be the proposed term of service contract in the RFP?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1 years 2. 2 years 3. 3 years 4. Get pricing for several different term lengths. 	<p>Staff recommends a two year term with an option for a single one-year extension. It is expected to take 2-3 years to identify and implement a long-term solution.</p>

Attachment A

November, 3, 2009

POLICY TOPIC	POLICY ISSUES	OPTIONS	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
<p><u>Contract Extensions or RFP - Waste Commitment Levels</u> Under the terms of the existing disposal contracts we have committed all waste received by the County to the various disposal sites. Additionally, we have put-or-pay requirements of 650 tons per day (TPD) - 450 TPD to Redwood Landfill and 200 TPD to Keller Canyon Landfill. Current total TPD averages about 900. Therefore we have put-or-pay on over 70% of the current waste stream.</p>	<p>What waste commitment and “put or pays” should the County contractually agree to in either extended contracts or an RFP?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. County to agree to commitment for disposal for <u>all</u> non-recycle material received at all County disposal facilities with <u>no</u> put-or-pay. 2. Put or Pay for County franchised waste only (approximately 20%) 3. Put or Pay for County franchised waste plus self-haul waste only (approximately 40%) 4. Put or Pay between 40%-100% 	<p>Staff recommends that the County commit to deliver all non-recyclable material received at the facilities to the selected disposal site(s) without any put-or-pay requirements.</p>