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Mr. Tom Padia  
Deputy Executive Director  
StopWaste  
1537 Webster Street  
Oakland, CA 94612

Subject: Proposal to Conduct a 5-Year Program Review for the Alameda County Source Reduction and Recycling Board

Dear Mr. Padia:

HF&H Consultants, LLC (HF&H) and our team members, Kelly Runyon and Delyn Kies are very pleased to provide the Alameda County Source Reduction and Recycling Board (StopWaste) with our proposal to perform the “5-Year Program Review: Broad Programmatic Overview and Evaluation (Review)”. We appreciate the opportunity to assist StopWaste by building on past Reviews and providing thought leadership. Our goal is to not only help you meet the requirements of Measure D, but to cost-efficiently deliver a high-value product that will materially assist StopWaste in planning for and accomplishing its near-term and longer-term goals.

Depth and Breadth of Experience

Our proposal reflects our experience with the Reviews completed in 2002 and 2008, our understanding of the 2012 report, as well as current and recent cutting-edge work conducted by our team leaders in a wide range of engagements such as:

- Designing and managing a pilot program for CVSan to maximize food scrap participation and explore options for less-than-weekly garbage collection.

- Developing funding strategies for leading Zero Waste communities like Santa Monica, San Diego, Monterey Regional WMD, and Santa Cruz County that stabilize revenues in the face of declining disposal volumes.

- Analyzing rate and material recovery impacts for five Alameda County member agencies for Phase 2 implementation of the County mandatory ordinance.

- Assisting San Francisco and StopWaste in designing and implementing award-winning programs for the commercial sector.

- Assisting Mountain View in designing and negotiating the cost of an every-other-week garbage collection program.
• Assisting Milpitas in assessing options for commingled organics collection, and for split cart garbage and foods scraps collection separate from yard trimmings.

• Assisting Milpitas, Daly City and Mountain View in framing future services, redefining “single-family” and “multi-family” programs to match the wide variety of housing types and collection conditions that are now a common feature of Bay Area high-density housing development.

• Assisting Oakland with implementation of its new mixed materials and organics, and recyclables collection franchises.

• Managing multi-year, master services consultant agreements covering all aspects of San Jose’s residential and commercial collection and material processing programs.

Our proposal provides full disclosure regarding work in Alameda County. As with the past Reviews we conducted for StopWaste, we believe our work with fourteen of the member agencies in Alameda County provides a “plus”. We provide unparalleled understanding of StopWaste and member agency programs, culture and goals. Given the revised nature of the approach this time around, that working knowledge is even more valuable in ensuring our understanding of the nuances of their programs – helping us really understand the data provided and minimizing the time spent by member agency staff to clarify those things for us.

We do not take lightly the trust implicit in being selected to conduct the Review, and hope to again have the opportunity to provide a quality Review.

Understanding the Challenge

Each of the 5 Year Reviews has been conducted in the context of its time, with the specific objectives reflecting the goals and challenges then facing StopWaste. StopWaste faces challenges both financially, due to the decline of Import Mitigation Funding from San Francisco, and in reaching the strategic goal of ten percent or less “good stuff in the garbage” by 2020. (Recent Benchmarking Service results indicate that there remains about 35 percent “good stuff in the garbage”.) The Board and StopWaste staff are now engaged in a process of identifying priorities for the next several years, working within the framework of the “Strategic Workplan 2020”. Within the next several years, the results of the 2017 Review and the data from the pending disposal stream characterization will play important roles as StopWaste plans for the years past 2020. In particular, the results of the Review and the characterization will assist StopWaste as it revisits the Strategic Workplan 2020 in an effort to determine how and whether to modify its existing goals.

The reduced budget for the 2017 Review presents a challenge for StopWaste. The challenge is one of value – “How can StopWaste best be assured that the Measure D-required tasks will be completed successfully and that the Review will generate useful information from the other key tasks that will directly factor into future planning, such as those identifying metrics and waste characterization comparisons with other high performing programs?” HF&H understands the challenge and appreciates the manner in which some tasks, such as for member agency comparative data, have been refined to
reduce necessary level of effort, and to focus on core information. We offer targeted approaches, and “higher level” and optional scopes of work for areas of the Review that we hope will enhance the value to StopWaste as it plans for the future.

**Meeting the Challenge by Creating Value**

Our proposal reflects added value in a number of ways.

**Team Experience and Continuity:** The range and breadth of relevant experience of the project team is unparalleled. This is especially important for a complex, multi-faceted and cross-connected project such as the Review:

- Rob Hilton (HF&H) managed the member agency data collection tasks for the 2008 Review and Peter Deibler (HF&H) managed both the 2002 and 2008 Reviews.
- Delyn Kies and Kelly Runyon each have a long history of assistance to StopWaste on a range of topics and projects. Ms. Kies is currently assisting StopWaste staff with strategic research and analysis and with EPP programs. Mr. Runyon is currently providing on-call assistance to the Benchmark Service. Delyn Kies and Kelly Runyon frequently collaborate with HF&H, including on the CVSan Less-Than-Weekly Pilot, and recently with contract implementation for Oakland and zero waste planning for Mountain View.
- Ben Collins (HF&H) offers a broad and thoughtful perspective from his work as a Waste Management of Alameda County representative to several of the member agencies and with San Francisco Department of the Environment.

**Cost Effectiveness:** We offer a scope of work that is well within StopWaste’s target budget, but that is fully responsive to the RFP and will deliver strategic value. We have identified and assigned a small group of individuals to work on this to ensure their focus and prevent inefficiencies resulting from “too many cooks in the kitchen.” In addition, we are offering our subcontractors without markup. With our extensive working experience together, we have full, well-earned confidence in our team members.

**Effective Communication:** Because of our history of work with StopWaste (and nearly all of the member agencies), we know and have worked with the staff that we’ll need to interview or otherwise communicate with for several of the tasks. In addition, we have collectively worked with every franchise hauler in Alameda County and understand the capabilities of their reporting systems. If we need additional data, we know how to ask for it in a manner that minimizes frustration for both the agency and their hauler(s).

**Flexibility:** As with past Reviews, we are flexible about adjusting our scope, and how resources are assigned to each task of the Review. We will adjust relative levels of effort to finalize the scopes of work, budgets, and assignments, or to add optional tasks during the project (following discussion with StopWaste’s project manager).
Scope Options: We understand the priority for a cost-effective work product and, as a result, have excluded tasks from our base proposal that we think are important but, perhaps, not essential. We offer these tasks as “higher effort” options in several areas. Each of these include all of the activity and deliverables defined for the corresponding “base level” task, plus additional, targeted work to enhance the value of the product in future planning. StopWaste can pick and choose whether to include some or all (or none) of the proposed higher effort tasks or subtasks in the 2017 Review.

Synthesis and Integration: Our scope identifies important connections between the tasks, and this is particularly the case in developing metrics. If selected, we will continue to leverage these and other connections as we plan and conduct the work. Planning task work as an integrated whole from the beginning, rather than as a set of individual tasks will result in improved usefulness of the findings and recommendations in addressing StopWaste’s broad goals.

Tools: Our team has access to hauler and municipal data from a wide range of collection and processing contexts, including HF&H’s database of program and industry benchmarks.

Proximity: All proposed consultants live and work just a short BART ride from StopWaste’s offices, allowing us to be more responsive to you.

We have organized our proposal to address all of the requirements of the RFP. We agree to be bound by StopWaste’s standard consultant agreement and insurance requirements with no exceptions. We will hold our proposal pricing firm for up to 120 days from the date of submittal. As required by the RFP, HF&H principal place of business is: 201 N. Civic Drive, Suite 230, Walnut Creek, CA 94596.

* * * *

If you have any questions regarding this submittal or if you would like to schedule an interview, please call Rob Hilton at (925) 977-6959 or Peter Deibler at (925) 977-6968.

Very truly yours,
HF&H CONSULTANTS, LLC

Robert C. Hilton, CMC  Peter M. Deibler
Vice President  Senior Project Manager

cc: Kim Erwin, HF&H
    Kelly Runyon, Independent Contractor
    Delyn Kies, Kies Strategies
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

- Project Understanding ................................................................. 1
- Disclosure ....................................................................................... 1
  - HF&H Consultants, LLC ................................................................. 1
  - Kelly Runyon, Independent Consultant ........................................ 1
  - Kies Strategies ............................................................................... 2

## SECTION 2: PROJECT TEAMS

- HF&H Consultants, LLC ................................................................. 5
  - Peter Deibler, Senior Project Manager ........................................... 6
  - Ben Collins, Associate Analyst ....................................................... 8
  - Kimberly Erwin, Senior Administrative Assistant ......................... 8
- Kelly Runyon, Independent Contractor ........................................... 9
- Kies Strategies ............................................................................... 9
  - Delyn Kies, Principal .................................................................... 9

## SECTION 3: QUALIFICATIONS

- HF&H Consultants, LLC ................................................................. 14
  - Firm Overview ............................................................................ 14
  - Alameda County Work History ..................................................... 15
- Kelly Runyon ............................................................................... 22
  - Overview ....................................................................................... 22
  - Kelly Runyon Relevant Experience ............................................. 23
- Kies Strategies ............................................................................... 23
  - Firm Overview ............................................................................ 23
  - Kies Strategies Relevant Experience .......................................... 24

## SECTION 4: SCOPE OF WORK

- Project Management ...................................................................... 26
- Identifying a Pool of High Performing Programs ......................... 26
- Use of Resources ......................................................................... 26
- Task Format .................................................................................. 26
  - Base Level Tasks ......................................................................... 26
  - Higher Level Tasks ..................................................................... 27
  - Optional Task ............................................................................. 27
  - Additional Task .......................................................................... 27
  - Integration of Tasks .................................................................... 28
  - Project Meetings ......................................................................... 29
- Scope of Work ............................................................................. 29
- Schedule ....................................................................................... 42

## SECTION 5: COST PROPOSAL

- Personnel Assignments and Base Level Hours ......................... 74
Estimated Monthly Billings ........................................................................................................ 74
Professional Fees .................................................................................................................. 75
Direct Expenses .................................................................................................................... 75
Billing Policies ....................................................................................................................... 75
Insurance ................................................................................................................................. 76
Invoices and Payment for Services ......................................................................................... 76

**ATTACHMENTS**

A. RFP Attachment A: Required Contract Elements
B. Key Staff Resumes
C. Additional Project Write-Ups and References
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

Project Understanding

As provided in the RFP, the objectives of the Program Review (Review) are to:

1. Meet statutory requirements of Measure D;

2. Profile and compare municipal waste reduction efforts in Alameda County with each other, and to broadly evaluate countywide waste reduction program effectiveness; and

3. Profile and evaluate diversion strategies, policies, programs and metrics that might help Alameda County meet and measure its success in achieving the “75% and Beyond” diversion goal, the “less than 10% good stuff in the garbage” goal by 2020, and other goals contained in the Strategic Workplan 2020 and in the Alameda County Integrated Waste Management Plan (CoIWMP).

Our management team has been involved in several of the past Reviews and are familiar with the two key types of tasks that are part of each scope:

- The compliance-related tasks required by Measure D. Some of these tasks have evolved over time, such as the compilation of member agency comparative data, while others such as review of Countywide programs have remained similar in scope and intent.

- Issue-focused tasks that will help inform StopWaste decision-making related to programs and diversion goals, such as the metrics and waste characterization tasks for the 2017 Review.

Each of the Reviews has been conducted in the context of its time, with the specific objectives for both types of tasks reflecting the goals and challenges then facing StopWaste. For this reason we have provided a detailed approach section for each task, describing how we understand and will conduct the work within the context of StopWaste’s current needs.

Disclosure

We are sensitive to avoiding perceived or actual conflicts of interest. Upon selection, we propose to discuss this issue in detail with StopWaste staff, and make any necessary modifications in staff assignments.

HF&H Consultants, LLC

See Section 3 for detail regarding our current and past work with StopWaste and with the member agencies.

Kelly Runyon, Independent Consultant

Kelly Runyon is currently an independent consultant with 35 years of experience in waste management and materials recovery design and operations. His work has included the planning and management of
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waste diversion efforts directed at businesses, multifamily complexes and schools in Alameda County and throughout the Bay Area.

Mr. Runyon is currently working on, or has recently completed the following projects in the County of Alameda:

• Stopwaste.org
  - Schools Infrastructure Project (Contract term ends October 31, 2016)
  - Multifamily / Commercial Recycling Guides for Designers / Managers (ended January 2016)

• Altamont Landfill Community Monitor Committee (City of Livermore, fiscal agent)
  - Community Monitor, 2008 - 2019

• City of Oakland
  - Franchise Agreement Implementation Support (ongoing)

• Castro Valley Sanitary District
  - Less-Than-Weekly Collection Pilot Program (ongoing)

**Kies Strategies**

Mr. Kies is currently working on, or has recently completed the following projects in the County of Alameda:

• StopWaste
  - Environmentally Preferable Purchasing assistance contract since 2001.

• StopWaste
  - C&D Facility Certification through Recycling Certification Institute (Delyn Kies is an approved evaluator but paid by StopWaste for quarterly evaluations at Davis Street Transfer Station).

• StopWaste
  - C&D Facility Diversion List Update.

• Castro Valley Sanitary District
  - Subcontractor to HF&H Consultants for Less Than Weekly Pilot Project (field work and communications assistance).
SECTION 2: PROJECT TEAMS

The following organization chart serves two functions. First, it illustrates the overall management of the Review and the roles of each team member. Second, it illustrates the management, and the staff assigned to, each task, as discussed further in Section 4.

HF&H Consultants, LLC

Rob C. Hilton, CMC, Vice President

Mr. Hilton will be the managing executive for the engagement, responsible for ensuring contractual compliance. He will be directly involved in developing and reviewing the findings and recommendations and report language, and in the presentations to the Board. He will contribute to work for Tasks 2, 4 and 6.

Since 2002, Rob Hilton has provided recycling and solid waste consulting services to public agencies in projects covering a wide range of strategic, operational, programmatic, contractual, and financial issues. Mr. Hilton’s background in public policy and administration and his involvement in over 290 projects for more than 110 agencies throughout the United States, gives him an understanding of the diverse conditions within the industry as well as the local market context that shapes each client’s unique needs.

Mr. Hilton has assisted dozens of communities throughout the state in the process of developing feasibility studies and strategic plans to achieve their high diversion or zero waste goals. The most comprehensive feasibility study performed by HF&H was the Mandatory Commercial Recycling Cost Study that Rob managed for CalRecycle and the Air Resources Board. This study estimated the diversion,
greenhouse gas, and cost impacts of the mandatory commercial recycling measure of AB 32 (later implemented as AB 341).

Mr. Hilton is directing consultant work for the CVSan Less-Than-Weekly Pilot, and recently completed Phase 2 analyses for five of the member agencies. He also managed the member agency task for StopWaste’s 2008 Review as well as working on a variety of the other Review tasks. He managed development of StopWaste’s franchise database which documents hundreds of key data points and rates from the member agency franchise agreements.

Mr. Hilton has assisted communities throughout the state in the process of developing strategic plans to achieve their high diversion or zero waste goals. In developing these plans, Mr. Hilton uses an analytical approach that involves benchmarking existing programs, identifying areas for improvement separate from programs that need to be replaced, estimating both the diversion potential as well as cost for programs and facilities, identifying infrastructure opportunities and gaps, and developing a strategy for phasing in programs so that the community will realize the greatest program- and cost-effectiveness. This analytical approach results in diversion plans that are more effective in developing the necessary community and political support to make them work. Mr. Hilton has managed program feasibility studies performed as part of high diversion/Zero Waste planning processes, and/or competitive procurements for agencies including the cities of Milpitas, Mountain View, Livermore, San Leandro, Fresno, Beverly Hills, Pasadena, San Diego, Santa Monica, the County of Kern, and the Monterey Regional Waste Management District.

Mr. Hilton has presented several papers to industry organizations on the subject of how to develop sustainable funding strategies that support your zero waste system. These papers are the result of research and projects conducted by HF&H on behalf of clients like the Alameda County Waste Management Authority, Monterey Regional Waste Management District, Kern County, the City of San Diego, and Sonoma County; all of whom have high diversion goals but fund their programs largely off of landfill disposal.

**Peter Deibler, Senior Project Manager**

Peter Deibler will serve as project manager. He will be the primary point of contact for StopWaste and will manage the subcontractors as well as HF&H staff. He will be Task Leader for Tasks 2, 3, 5, 7 and 8, and will be responsible for developing the findings and recommendations, compiling the draft and final reports, and presenting the results with Rob Hilton.

Mr. Deibler is a Senior Manager with HF&H Consultants, with over 30 years of experience in the waste management field. He has a background in resource economics and has assisted dozens of public sector clients. Mr. Deibler specializes in policy, process, financial and legal issues related to diversion programs and waste management program and facility procurements and negotiations. He frequently drafts and negotiates service contracts and is well versed in local government setting of fees and rates. His work often involves public process and facilitating decision making by senior staff and elected officials. He is a frequent presenter on a range of topics. He has directed or managed numerous projects related to zero waste and high diversion planning, service procurement, commercial technical assistance, household and business hazardous
materials and hazardous waste reduction, contract and rate review negotiations, performance review and contract compliance, rate analysis and structuring, budget projections and planning, and cost of service.

Mr. Deibler managed StopWaste’s 2002 “5 Year Review”, while working with Brown, Vence and Associates, Inc., and the 2008 Programmatic Review while working at HF&H Consultants. He was directly involved in the work for all tasks, wrote the draft and final reports and presented the results to the Recycling Board and to the Programs Committee of the Authority. He has also managed a number of other projects for StopWaste, such as the recent review of future HHW options and modeling of the new program funding structure. Key current and recent projects that are directly relevant to the Review include:

- Managing a consultant team in conducting a pilot of less-than-weekly garbage collection for the Castro Valley Sanitary District.
- Assisting the city of Mountain View in contractor negotiations to provide every-other-week garbage collection and related organics processing that build on earlier zero waste planning and modeling conducted for the city by HF&H.
- Advising a regional wastewater utility in planning for, competitively procuring and negotiating for pre-processing of delivered organics prior to digestion.
- Managing a procurement for the city of Milpitas integrating pending AB 1826 organics management requirements, and anticipating SB 1383 requirements.
- Managing the last two SMaRT Station facility operator procurements for the city of Sunnyvale.
- Managing a multi-consultant team for the city of San José under a three year master services agreement to assist with its residential collection and processing program, with a focus on the effectiveness of program diversion.
- Managing a procurement for the city of Daly City and negotiating a final agreement that requires nearly a doubling of the current contractor diversion rate.
- Reviewing Recology’s new residential “zero waste” rate structure for the city of San Francisco in his role as the city’s Rate Payer Advocate.
- Assisting Santa Barbara County in its efforts towards developing a MRF and anaerobic digestion facility design/build/operate agreement targeting 60% diversion of the current disposal stream.
- Managing the city of San Jose’s commercial services procurement for wet/dry collection and anaerobic digestion of organics, to meet a commercial diversion goal of 80%.
- Advising during development of the zero waste plan for Pasadena.
Ben Collins, Associate Analyst

Ben Collins will provide staff assistance for a range of tasks, with a focus on Tasks 2, 3 and 6.

Mr. Collins is a recent addition to our staff at HF&H. He brings 11 years of prior financial and accounting experience as well as 7 years of diverse experience in the solid waste industry. While in the private sector, he spent more than two years managing municipal contracts, creating outreach programs, and providing technical assistance for commercial and multi-family customers in the cities of Albany, Emeryville, Newark, and San Ramon. Ben also received invaluable insight into implementing city zero waste programs and addressing customer concerns during his 18 month internship with the City of San Francisco’s Department of the Environment Zero Waste Team. While at the Department of the Environment, Mr. Collins worked with multi-family property owners, manager, and residents to implement recycling and composting as part of the city’s Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance. Ben performed countless hours of public outreach in San Francisco including door-to-door outreach with tenants, presentations to the San Francisco Apartment Association, and site trainings with property managers and facilities staff. In his native Oklahoma, Ben was a member of a select Citizen’s Taskforce where he led many public meetings and a 700 person phone survey during a two year process to develop the State’s first Residential Pay-As-You-Throw collection system and the City of Tulsa’s first Residential collection update in over 30 years.

Kimberly Erwin, Senior Administrative Assistant

Kim Erwin will assist with work on Task 2 Comparative Data working with member agency staff to verify data, as needed.

From 2007 through 2015, Ms. Erwin has gathered and analyzed data to determine the sustainability of ACWMA’s current practices related to their solid waste tonnage and recycling programs, as well as their energy and water consumption. Kim Erwin played a significant role in collecting the information for the Franchise Task Force Database Project and assisted in the evaluation of residential and commercial recycling programs for StopWaste’s 2007 5-Year Review.

Ms. Erwin has assisted on many other solid waste and recycling projects including: surveying of rates and programs for comparability for several dozen municipalities in the state; providing procurement support to the City of Milpitas, Santa Barbara County, and several other clients. Kim is currently assisting with a zero waste plan for the County of San Diego.

Kimberly Erwin has a breadth of experience encompassing every aspect of HF&H’s operations. Ms. Erwin is responsible for proofing and editing the majority of documents that leave our Walnut Creek office.
Kelly Runyon, Independent Contractor

Kelly Runyon will be the Task Leader for Task 4 Metrics and Task 6 Waste Characterizations, and will contribute to most other tasks.

Kelly Runyon is a self-employed independent consultant with over 35 years of experience as an environmental engineer and planner. His formal education includes a Bachelor of Science degree in Mathematics from Michigan State University; an MS in Mechanical Engineering with an emphasis on solid waste processing systems from UC Berkeley; and course work in Geographic Information Systems from the San Francisco State University Extension.

He began his career in solid waste and recycling with work as a test engineer at one of the first mechanized Material Recovery Facilities in the US, in 1978. Subsequently, he has worked for several consulting engineering and planning firms, as well as a major refuse and recycling service provider in the SF Bay Area. Throughout, his work has focused on the design, implementation and evaluation of improved waste diversion and waste reduction. Some projects have involved centralized methods (e.g., material recovery facilities); others were more decentralized, involving source reduction and source separation at the generator/customer level.

His current independent work is a continuation of his consulting career, focusing on local jurisdictions’ needs to increase diversion from landfill while protecting resources and controlling costs. This typically entails evaluating current services, identifying unmet needs, and costing out potential solutions. It often involves detailed analyses and monitoring of current activities, with comparisons to proposed alternatives.

He resides in San Francisco and has been involved with projects throughout the US, including the New England states, Florida, Louisiana, Illinois, Colorado, and the West Coast.

Kies Strategies

Delyn Kies, Principal

Ms. Kies will lead the work on Task 5 Review of Countywide Programs and will contribute to, and provide review and comment for a number of tasks.

Delyn Kies is skilled and experienced in program design and implementation, research and analysis, public policy development, facility siting, and community relations.

Ms. Kies was a member of the consultant team led by HF&H Consultants performing the 5-year review of diversion programs for each of the 17 member agencies and Alameda County-wide programs in 2007. Ms. Kies’ contributions included technical review of alternative funding options, measurement of recycling and diversion, and approaches to mandatory recycling and to local and regional landfill bans based on review of programs from around the country. She also conducted interviews and research and prepared reports summarizing new information and applicability of commercial packaging reduction efforts for Alameda.
County, tools for predicting diversion opportunities (recycling, reuse and waste prevention) by industry types and by materials, and key findings for private sector recycling and market trends.

Other relevant experience consists of research, public involvement and development of implementation plans and programs for jurisdictions throughout the western United States. She has conducted research and analysis, made public presentations, provided senior technical review, and completed several solid waste management plans for jurisdictions in California, Oregon, Nevada, Hawaii, Wyoming, Colorado, Alaska, New Mexico, Washington State and the U.S. Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Key components of these plans have included facilitation and work with regulators, elected officials, technical staff, the media, local businesses and citizen groups.

Ms. Kies is skilled in developing and implementing effective recycling, composting and waste prevention programs. She has performed research and analysis, facilitated decision-making and provided recommendations for new and improved waste reduction programs for numerous jurisdictions. She has provided on-site technical assistance to businesses in recycling, composting and waste prevention continuously since 2002. Her efforts have resulted in documented new and ongoing diversion from landfill disposal.
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HF&H Consultants, LLC

HF&H has a long history in Alameda County. We have conducted a number of projects for StopWaste. Since 1986, we have performed over 200 projects for more than 20 clients within the County. These clients include the County of Alameda and the cities of: Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Newark, Oakland, Piedmont, Pleasanton, San Leandro, and Union City. We have also provided services to the following regional agencies in the county: Stopwaste.org, Alameda County Water District, Castro Valley Sanitary District, Fremont Unified School District, Joint Refuse Rate Review Council, Oro Loma Sanitary District, and the Solid Waste Advisory Committee. HF&H has provided services such as: technical assistance, recycling assistance, procurement planning and negotiations, program planning, AB 939 reporting, and rate reviews.

Firm Overview

HF&H’s mission is to apply environmental, economic, and social principles to support each client’s vision of a sustainable future.

For nearly 30 years, from our offices in Northern and Southern California, we have provided leadership, expertise, independence, and support to more than 400 municipal agencies through more than 2,000 engagements. The results of these engagements have been to reduce tons of greenhouse gas emissions, recycle tons of materials, and create hundreds of "green" jobs.

We approach each engagement with certain core values:

- **We serve our clients** — exceptionally, with a desire for strong interpersonal relationships, a focus on each engagement’s objectives, and with an understanding of each client’s broader goals.

- **We relate to each other** — warmly, supporting personal growth and professional development, with pride in the work we do and the accomplishments of our clients.

- **We operate the firm** — with commitment to the environment, public service, and integrity.

HF&H is a limited liability company founded in 1989. HF&H’s three founding partners, Robert Hilton, John Farnkopf, and Scott Hobson worked together for several years for a "Big Six" accounting firm. At this "Big Six" firm, they developed their professional approach to management consulting that includes:

- Focusing on client objectives and goals;
- Agreeing with the clients on the work to be performed, the time, and the budget;
- Staffing projects with a team of qualified consultants;
- Documenting and performing effective quality control review of the work performed; and,
- Communicating frequently with the client.

The work of sustainability requires management – and that is where we excel. We help lead each client in defining a vision of a sustainable environment; we develop long-range resource and financial plans for
the achievement of that vision; we help procure, manage and price the services that contribute to the achievement of our client’s vision; and we evaluate the performance of those services in order to improve their accomplishments. Our services include, but are not limited to:

- RFP Development and Negotiations
- Recycling Planning
- Performance Management
- Economic and Cost-of-Service Studies
- Recycling and Resource Management
- Public Outreach and Education
- Contractor Selection and Management
- Rate Structure and Fee Studies
- Litigation Consulting
- Regulatory Support Proprietary Tools

HF&H’s knowledge of the industry is unrivaled. We have developed an extensive database of industry data from assessing current operations and evaluating proposals from most of the solid waste providers working in California. We were selected from among our competitors by CalRecycle (formerly the California Integrated Waste Management Board) to determine the cost of mandatory commercial recycling in California largely based on the information contained in this database.

**Alameda County Work History**

Following are two matrices showing the history of HF&H’s work with StopWaste and the member agencies. One lists all work performed for StopWaste since our inception in 1989 along with references for each project. The other matrix lists recent work performed for member agencies and other Alameda County clients. Please see Attachment C for additional project experience and references. HF&H would be happy to elaborate on any of the projects that we have provided in this section.

**StopWaste Work History**

HF&H has conducted work for the Alameda County Waste Management Authority and Source Reduction and Recycling Board (StopWaste) since 1994, including projects on the institution of landfill bans, improving recycling, analyzing StopWaste’s landfill disposal, and rate technical assistance. Below we provide a matrix of our work for the Authority in its entirety in chronological order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Client Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Indicators</td>
<td>2003-2015</td>
<td>Identified and measured recycling and sustainability indicators to provide quantitative measures for assessing sustainability performance.</td>
<td>Debra Kaufman (510) 891-6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHW Program Technical Assistance</td>
<td>2012; 2013</td>
<td>Evaluated current program performance in comparison to programs in Santa Clara County and San Francisco. Modeled current costs and revenues, and developed and modelled projected revenues under various scenarios for future program design. The model served as the analytical basis for new HHW funding mechanism.</td>
<td>Debra Kaufman (510) 891-6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Client Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Data Gathering</td>
<td>2010-12</td>
<td>Input franchise agreement information into a custom-built database, creating a complete and current database documenting key provisions of member agencies’ solid waste and recycling contracts.</td>
<td>Meghan Starkey (510) 891-6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHW Program Review</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Comparative review of HHW programs managed by Alameda County, the City of Fremont, San Francisco, and Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Debra Kaufman (510) 891-6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StopWaste Partnership</td>
<td>2000-10</td>
<td>Provided direct waste prevention and recycling technical assistance as needed.</td>
<td>Rory Bakke (510) 891-6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Programs Survey</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Surveyed a variety of affected parties and perspectives regarding commercial collection, diversion, and mandatory recycling programs.</td>
<td>Tom Padia (510) 891-6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Franchise Input</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Provided limited assistance to Oakland on they might restructure their franchise system.</td>
<td>Debra Kaufman (510) 891-6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year Measure D Audits</td>
<td>2001, 2006</td>
<td>Worked closely with StopWaste and each member agency to profile existing programs and identify additional/enhanced programs.</td>
<td>Tom Padia (510) 891-6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of HHW and Small Generator Programs</td>
<td>1997-98; 1999-00; 2002-03</td>
<td>Managed a broad-based financial, management, and program audit of the County’s HHW program</td>
<td>Karen Smith (510) 891-6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Industry Analysis</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Quantified the economic impact of recycling in the County, identifying the number of businesses handling recycled materials and the number of jobs created by the industry.</td>
<td>Brian Mathews (510) 891-6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure D Compliance Audit</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Conducted comprehensive review of source reduction and recycling programs operated by member agencies and three other agencies within the County.</td>
<td>Tom Padia (510) 891-6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosolids Co-Composting Feasibility</td>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>Evaluated the economics, technology, and overall feasibility of two biosolids co-composting projects in Alameda County.</td>
<td>Lois Clarke (510) 891-6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Co-compost Facility</td>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>Assisted in the development planning for an integrated waste management facility for use by Authority member agencies.</td>
<td>Lois Clarke (510) 891-6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRF/Compost Facility Feasibility Analysis</td>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>Completed a system planning and development process for the Authority.</td>
<td>Tom Padia (510) 891-6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Audits of Businesses</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Managed a solid waste assessment (waste audit) project for the Authority and its member agencies.</td>
<td>Rory Kessler-Bakke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Franchise Review

- **Project Title:** Franchise Review
- **Year(s):** 1991-92
- **Description:** Examined waste and recycling agreements for the Authority’s member jurisdictions to determine ability to direct the flow of refuse, recyclables, and yard waste.
- **Client Contact:** Tom Padia (510) 891-6500

### Other Alameda County Work History

Since our inception in 1989, we have worked for many of the jurisdictions within Alameda County. Below we summarize the breadth of experience we have gained while working in Alameda County for nearly 30 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name/Project Title</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Water District/Engineer’s Report</td>
<td>2012, 2015</td>
<td>Prepared an Engineer’s Report as part of the District’s planned bond issuance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Alameda</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauler Rate Review</td>
<td>2003-Present</td>
<td>Performed reviews of Alameda County Industries’ (ACI’s) rate adjustment applications for the collection of refuse, recyclable and organic materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Negotiations</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Providing consulting services to initiate a Statement of Interest (SOI) process for the purposes of securing disposal services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations</td>
<td>2012; 2015</td>
<td>Assisted the City in the review and renegotiation of their franchise agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Procurement</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Assisted the City in identifying a future contractor and preparing and negotiating a future disposal agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StopWaste Phase 2 Impact</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Evaluated the impacts to solid waste system revenues, costs, and diversion levels if the City participated in Phase 2 of StopWaste’s Mandatory Recycling Ordinance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Alternative Rates</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Restructured City’s existing solid waste rates to better reflect the cost of service while generating sufficient revenue to cover collection and processing costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Call Solid Waste Disposal Services</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Reviewed Waste Management of Alameda County’s requested adjustment to the disposal tip fee charged to the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name/Project Title</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Procurement</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Prepared a request for proposals and disposal agreement; evaluated two proposals from prospective service providers; negotiated the final agreement; and assisted staff with presentations to City Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Code Revisions</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Updated the sections of the City's municipal code that address solid waste, recyclable materials and organic materials collection; transportation, processing, and disposal services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Collection Procurement</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Managed the City of Alameda's procurement process, designed to select one or more service providers to collect solid waste, recyclable materials, and organic materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Alameda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauler Regulation System</td>
<td>2009-12</td>
<td>Assisted the County in establishing a hauler regulation system to manage and monitor collection activities in the eastern area of Alameda County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Albany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Negotiations</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Assisted with negotiations of a ten-year extension to its existing franchise agreements. Consolidated three agreements into one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Call Solid Waste Rate Support</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Provided on-call support to assist new staff with the use of their solid waste rate model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Study</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>HF&amp;H analyzed 5 commercial system options for impacts to the Zero Waste Fund, General Fund, staffing, required acquisition or sale of assets, the City’s Zero Waste Goal, customer service, cost of service, and street/road and traffic impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse Rate Study</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Developed a new rate setting model (residential, commercial and the transfer operations) to be compliant with Proposition 218 and remedy the City’s Solid Waste Fund deficit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StopWaste Phase 2 Impact</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Evaluated the impacts to solid waste system revenues, costs, and diversion levels if the City participated in Phase 2 of StopWaste’s Mandatory Recycling Ordinance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro Valley Sanitary District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Rates Assistance</td>
<td>2015; 2016</td>
<td>Assisting in reviewing the July 2016 rate adjustment calculations prepared by WMAC and amending their Disposal Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Weekly Garbage Pilot</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>Managing pilot program exploring the effects of Less-Than-Weekly garbage collection, coupled with effective and ongoing outreach and education, which are anticipated to have positive impacts for material collected in all three carts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name/Project Title</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Contracting Trends</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Provided information on recent trends in franchise negotiations, competitive procurements, and services in preparation for their future franchising efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Emeryville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StopWaste Phase 2 Impact</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Evaluated the impacts to solid waste system revenues, costs, and diversion levels if the City participated in Phase 2 of StopWaste’s Mandatory Recycling Ordinance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Demolition Debris Ordinance</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Researched ordinances in neighboring jurisdictions, analyzed building permit data, prepared a matrix of policy alternatives, drafted the ordinance and council memo, and provided training to planning and building staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fremont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Funding Options</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Reviewed approaches other California agencies have taken to fund their stormwater programs; evaluated the steps taken to date by the City of Fremont to fund its program; and recommended options for the City to consider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate Comparison</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Assisted the City to determine whether its hauler’s proposed rates were competitive, by conducting a detailed comparison to approximately ten similar (in population and geographic conditions, scope of franchise services, and collection methodologies) cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hayward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Collection &amp; Disposal Procurement</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Assisted the City in the preparation of preparation of an RFP for franchised collection, processing, and marketing of recyclable and organic materials, and for collection, processing and disposal of waste directed to landfill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Recycling</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Designed a commercial recycling program for the City of Hayward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Franchise Agreement</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Assisted the City in drafting a new franchise agreement using best practices and clearly-stated terms in a manner that facilitates contract compliance and franchise management throughout the term of the agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Livermore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Rate Reviews</td>
<td>2004-Present</td>
<td>During the rate reviews for the City: discussed policy issues with the Company representatives; performed application compliance and consistency testing; tested for mathematical accuracy; tested for logical consistency; investigated unusual findings; reviewed projected revenues; and, calculated reasonable profit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauler Special Rate Adjustment</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Reviewed hauler’s special rate adjustment request resulting from an affiliated company’s labor issues related to union activities and the City’s living wage ordinance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Agency Name/Project Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### StopWaste Phase 2 Impact
- **2013**: Evaluated the impacts to solid waste system revenues, costs, and diversion levels if the City participated in Phase 2 of StopWaste’s Mandatory Recycling Ordinance.

### Solid Waste Rate Calculator
- **2013**: Trained City staff related to understanding of and assistance with the Franchise Rate Revenue Impact Calculator that HF&H prepared for StopWaste.org as well as to provide general support to the City staff in preparing for solid waste rate workshops with the City Council.

### Landfill Host Fee and Updates to Landfill Host Fee
- **2009; 2010; 2012**: Performed study to project the revenues from the Altamont and Vasco Road Landfills Host Fees related to the financing of the new regional theatre. Subsequently updated the Host Fee projections two times.

### High Diversion Plan
- **2011**: Prepared a High Diversion Strategic Plan that identifies the key focus areas. These include: (1) maximizing participation and success of the current residential and commercial diversion programs; (2) expanding C&D diversion through modification and/or enforcement of the City’s C&D ordinance and permitted hauler regulations and support of local C&D processing efforts; and (3) diverting materials disposed of by self-haulers.

### Solid Waste Procurement
- **1999; 2008**: Assisted the City with the development of a request for proposals for solid waste, recycling, and compostables collection services.

### Refuse Vehicle Impact Fee Study
- **2004; 2007**: Studied the impact of both refuse and construction vehicles on city streets and performed an update to our analysis in 2007.

### City of Newark

#### Recycling Technical Assistance
- **1997-2013**: Annually prepared the City’s Annual AB 939 report; promote increased diversion of multi-family and commercial recyclables; facilitate construction and demolition recycling; and served as a liaison to County recycling programs.

#### Solid Waste Procurement
- **2012**: Assisted the City with the competitive procurement of recyclables, organics, and solid waste collection services, and recyclables and organics processing.

#### Multi-Family Incentive Program
- **2003**: Assisted the City to implement a program that involved providing a financial incentive to property managers.

### City of Oakland

#### Special Assessment Review
- **2016**: Assisted the City and its hauler in developing and documenting a reconciliation process for the flow of dollars and data between the two parties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name/Project Title</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero Waste Implementation Assistance</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>After finalizing its franchise agreements with two service providers for recycling, organics and refuse collection, Oakland’s Environmental Services Division retained three consulting firms, including HF&amp;H and ESA, to monitor performance, identify problems, and recommend solutions that would provide high quality services to residents and businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauler Pro-Forma Review</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Assisted with the evaluation of a proposal by Waste Management of Alameda County to modify its current solid waste collection system within the City. We reviewed the Company’s proposal for financial and technical reasonableness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Pleasanton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Rate Update</td>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>Assisted the city in updating their water rates for 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of San Leandro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Rate Review</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Assessed the reasonableness of the City’s hauler’s request for an adjustment to collection rates to cover increased costs associated with increasing wage rates for workers at the hauler’s MRF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Diversion Plan</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Prepared a High Diversion Plan to serve as a guide for the City to exceed its 75% diversion goal and support its Climate Action Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Union City</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate Reviews</td>
<td>2006-Present</td>
<td>HF&amp;H assists the City annually with the review of their two haulers’ requested rate adjustments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLT Negotiations Assistance</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Assisted the City in negotiating the resolution of contract matters related to the City’s agreement with BLT for material transfer services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Performance Reviews</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Provided the City with an independent assessment of the performance of its haulers to determine whether to negotiate or put the services out to bid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLT Extraordinary Review</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Provided general consulting services advising the City on issues related to an extraordinary request presented by BLT to the City as well as responding to any challenge to the City’s response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Negotiations Assistance</td>
<td>2014; 2015</td>
<td>Provided advisory services related to the City’s contracting arrangements for solid waste and diversion services with two haulers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StopWaste Phase 2 Impact</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Evaluated the impacts to solid waste system revenues, costs, and diversion levels if the City participated in Phase 2 of StopWaste’s Mandatory Recycling Ordinance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Agency Name/Project Title | Year(s) | Description
--- | --- | ---
Franchise Fee Review | 2012 | Reviewed franchise fee compensation to determine if the paid fees accorded with the Franchise Agreement. Also verified the accuracy of customer charges for customers billed by the hauler.
Solid Waste Technical Assistance | 2005-06 | Assisted the City in the stimulation and improvement of its recycling programs, especially related to small business recycling and organics, multi-family recycling, school recycling and organics, residential food waste, and electronics recycling events.
CalRecycle Annual Reports | 2004-06 | Prepared the City's 2002-2004 Annual Reports to comply with AB 939 requirements.
Solid Waste Procurement | 2003 | Assisted the City of Union City with procurement of solid waste and organics materials collection, processing, and disposal services.

### Kelly Runyon

#### Overview

Kelly Runyon is a self-employed independent consultant with over 35 years of experience as an environmental engineer and planner. This includes employment with several major consulting firms, work as a test engineer for a Material Recovery Facility (MRF) system designer, and operations and management experience with a major refuse and recycling service provider in the SF Bay Area.

His current work is a continuation of his consulting career, focusing on local jurisdictions’ needs to increase diversion from landfill while protecting resources and controlling costs. This typically entails evaluating current services, identifying unmet needs, and costing out potential solutions. It often involves detailed analyses and monitoring of current activities, with comparisons to proposed alternatives.

Mr. Runyon's education includes a Bachelor of Science degree in Mathematics from Michigan State University; an MS in Mechanical Engineering with an emphasis on solid waste processing systems from UC Berkeley; and course work in Geographic Information Systems from the San Francisco State University Extension. He resides in San Francisco and has been involved with projects throughout the US, including the New England states, Florida, Louisiana, Illinois, Colorado, and the West Coast.
Kelly Runyon Relevant Experience

SF Dept. of the Environment | Diversion Technical Assistance (2008-15)

For many years, the San Francisco Department of the Environment has been working to reduce solid wastes, to reach the City’s stated goal of achieving zero waste by 2020. Beginning in 2004, Mr. Runyon was part of the Environmental Science Associates consulting team that provided specialized assistance to large businesses, multifamily complexes and high-rise buildings. He managed that team from 2008 through 2015.

Mr. Runyon provided a wide variety of specialized forms of assistance, including: site-specific waste characterization (visual and sorted), “snapshot” evaluations of high-rise recycling performance at the tenant level, and coordination of outreach team members to match their skills with customers’ needs. He also oversaw the preparation of quarterly performance reports to City staff.

The team continuously logged increases in diversion while meeting the City’s cost-effectiveness targets.


In July 2015, the City of Oakland implemented refuse and recycling franchise agreements with a goal of dramatically reducing the amount of waste sent to landfill. These agreements require new processing facilities and more intensive use of existing facilities. They also require more detailed performance monitoring than previously.

Mr. Runyon has provided guidance to City staff regarding proposed methods of measuring performance, and has monitored periodic, contractually-required performance tests at the material recovery facility (MRF) that processes residential recyclables. He is assisting with the ongoing evaluation of other performance monitoring methods.

MRF performance has thus far been satisfactory. More importantly, the general description of performance requirements in the franchise agreement has been interpreted through a mutually agreed upon monitoring protocol.

Kies Strategies

Firm Overview

Delyn Kies is owner and principal of Kies Strategies. The firm was started in December 2001 and is based in Novato, California. Ms. Kies has more than 33 years of experience in the environmental management field with a primary focus in integrated solid waste management. She is the former solid waste manager for both Washington County and the City of Portland, Oregon.

She specializes in commercial recycling and composting technical assistance, environmentally preferable purchasing, waste prevention and waste management planning for businesses and local governments.
She has particular expertise in construction and demolition debris recycling, household hazardous waste management, and green building operations and maintenance practices.

**Kies Strategies Relevant Experience**

### StopWaste

#### Five-Year Programmatic Review (2007)

Ms. Kies was a member of the consultant team led by HF&H Consultants performing the 5-year review of diversion programs for each of the 17 member agencies and Alameda County-wide programs in 2007. Ms. Kies’ contributions included technical review of alternative funding options, measurement of recycling and diversion, and approaches to mandatory recycling and to local and regional landfill bans based on review of programs from around the country. She also conducted interviews and research and prepared reports summarizing new information and applicability of commercial packaging reduction efforts for Alameda County, tools for predicting diversion opportunities (recycling, reuse and waste prevention) by industry types and by materials, and key findings for private sector recycling and market trends.

### StopWaste

#### Strategic Research and Analysis (2002-Present)

Ms. Kies has provided strategic research and analysis for waste prevention policies and programs for StopWaste since 2002. Ms. Kies developed the content for StopWaste’s Paperless Express Guide and assisted Agency staff in identifying and developing Waste Prevention Best Practices and outreach programs to increase adoption of priority practices by businesses and institutions in Alameda County. This laid the groundwork for the Use Reusables Campaign that offers educational workshops and resources to help businesses make the switch to reusable transport packaging.

### StopWaste

#### Environmental Purchasing (2001-Present)

Ms. Kies has been a member of the staff and consultant team assisting member agencies and businesses in Alameda County in the purchase of recycled content and environmentally preferable products since 2001. Ms. Kies has assisted a dozen jurisdictions and public agencies in the County in adopting Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Policies and continues work to help implement the preferred practices. She also developed the content and worked with StopWaste’s purchasing and green building teams to produce the Guide to Green Maintenance and Operations in addition to developing and updating StopWaste’s numerous purchasing resources.
City of Hayward  Commercial Recycling Technical Assistance (2009-10)

Ms. Kies was a member of the consultant team tasked to increase recycling from businesses throughout the City. Services included recruiting and training businesses, monitoring and trouble-shooting. During 2009-2010, Ms. Kies conducted door-to-door outreach and participated in business association presentations and events. Ms. Kies achieved a 71% success rate in new sign-ups for recycling services from eligible businesses without current recycling service.

Portland Metro  Waste Reduction/Recycling Research & Analysis (Ongoing)

Ms. Kies has provided a variety of waste reduction and recycling research, analysis and implementation services to Metro over the last 2 decades. Projects have ranged from identifying and evaluating best management practices (including targeted generators and waste streams, probable tonnage diversion, feasibility of implementation, and implementation cost) to conducting research, surveys and interviews on shipping and packaging waste prevention in the Metro region. In 2010, Ms. Kies conducted research and assisted in preparing reports for two projects: (1) researching cooperative program opportunities with local building code officials to increase salvage, reuse and recycling of building materials from permitted construction and demolition projects and (2) developing an outreach plan and tools for increasing waste reduction and recycling in the medical sector. Key elements of the process included outreach, interviews and focus groups with targeted stakeholders.

San Francisco  Commercial Recycling Technical Assistance (2003-Present)

Ms. Kies has been a key member of the consultant team providing recycling, composting, and waste prevention technical assistance to businesses and institutions in partnership with SF Environment staff and private collectors since 2003. She is the lead in providing assistance to multi-tenant office/retail/residential buildings including site visits, program recommendations, program implementation, outreach materials, trainings and evaluation surveys. During FY 09-10, this type of assistance was provided to over 60 properties. She was also instrumental in establishing and administering the San Francisco Mini-Grants Program that provided funding to businesses to start or expand recycling, composting or waste prevention programs. The Program was conducted between from 2007 - 2011.
SECTION 4: SCOPE OF WORK

Project Management

As for past Reviews, we recommend a standing weekly or twice-per-month call between StopWaste and HFH project managers to discuss current and planned project issues. Scheduled calls maximize the efficiency of each project manager, provide each party a single point of contact, and ensure StopWaste is kept well-informed of project status.

Identifying a Pool of High Performing Programs

We plan to draw on a set of “high performing” programs to enhance work on Task 2 Compile Comparative Data Tables, Task 4 Identify Metrics, Task 6 Recoverable Materials in the Disposal Stream, and the optional multi-family organics task. Our initial thought is that we will draw on programs from jurisdictions such as San Jose, San Francisco, San Diego, Portland Metro, Seattle, Mountain View, Palo Alto, Sunnyvale and Chula Vista. Use of this program information will be tailored based on applicability and comparability of information to specific tasks.

Use of Resources

A key strength of the HF&H team is our access to diversion-related data as a means for comparison with activities in Alameda County, and in developing metrics. HF&H maintains an extensive database of recycling, organics and solid waste programs for most of the metropolitan areas of the State. HF&H's diversion benchmarking database includes proprietary data from "zero waste procurements" and negotiations, rate reviews, high diversion and zero waste planning, and our own surveys, as well as publicly available data from Cal-Recycle, StopWaste, and other sources. The database includes residential recycling data from over 200 communities. We also collect and enter data from each of our client jurisdictions at the end of each engagement. This data consists of collection program information (e.g. frequency, method, location, etc.), facility information (e.g. facilities used for each stream, tip fees paid, governmental fees assessed, etc.), and rates charged for various service levels by customer type, including any fee component (e.g. AB 939 Fees, Franchise Fees, etc.).

Task Format

Our scope of work is provided below, and each task is preceded by a task-specific approach section.

The following table illustrates our approach to the tasks. We look forward to discussing and finalizing our scope and fee estimate with StopWaste’s contract manager.

Base Level Tasks

We have provided tasks descriptions and fees estimates for the seven substantive tasks outlined in Section V. of the RFP, and they are numbered as Tasks 2 through 8 in our scope of work. Our base level tasks are fully responsive to the requirements of the RFP. The base level tasks are included the first fee estimate as provided in Section 5, and total to a budget well below target budget.
Higher Level Tasks

We are offering four higher level tasks, one each for Task 2 Compile Comparative Data Tables, Task 3 Compile Diversion Data, Task 4 Identify Key Comparative Metrics and Task 6 Comparative Review of Recoverable Material in Disposal Streams. Each higher-level tasks, each is inclusive of all base level work, and either adds specific new activities and/or a greater level of effort to the base level activities. Thus, for instance, if StopWaste is interested in the higher level Task 4, that scope of work and fee estimate can be substituted for the Task 4 base level effort. In some cases, the need for, or value of a higher level effort may not be apparent until the base level work has been done, in which case the higher activity can be added at that time if desired. The higher level tasks are included on a stand-alone basis in a second fee estimate, as provided in Section 5.

Optional Task

We are offering one optional task related to multi-family organics programs, with our fee estimate included with the higher level tasks in the second fee estimate provided in Section 5.

Additional Task

Our description of Task 6 Comparative Review of Recoverable Material in Disposal Streams notes at a conceptual level the potential value of reviewing the results from various targeted sorts conducted by high performing jurisdictions for recyclables, organics, MRF contamination and residue compliance, etc. We have not provided a detailed scope or budget for this activity, but would be glad to do so if it is of interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HF&amp;H Task</th>
<th>RFP Description</th>
<th>Base Level of Effort Task</th>
<th>Higher Level of Effort Task</th>
<th>Optional Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 2 Compile Comparative Data Tables</td>
<td>Propose key program parameters and performance metrics to extract from existing data sets and present a select few tables of comparative data from the member agencies, and compile other data sets and program profiles from existing and readily available sources.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3 Compile Diversion Data</td>
<td>Compile and present existing metrics of (CalRecycle) diversion rates by jurisdiction, and StopWaste data on “percent good stuff in the garbage.”</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4 Identify Key Comparative Metrics</td>
<td>Propose key metrics that may be used to measure and compare municipal waste reduction efforts in the future, utilizing commonly or easily available data.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HF&H Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 5 Review Countywide Programs</th>
<th>RFP Description</th>
<th>Base Level of Effort Task</th>
<th>Higher Level of Effort Task</th>
<th>Optional Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadly evaluate the effectiveness and impacts of countywide waste reduction programs, focusing on the primary areas of discards management, product decisions, and communications.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Task 6 Comparative Review of Recoverable Material in Disposal Streams | Research other states, regions and jurisdictions that have conducted landfill waste characterization studies comparable to those conducted for StopWaste in 1995, 2000 and 2008 (and planned for 2017), and analyze results of overall percentages by weight of commonly recycled and composted materials remaining in the landfill stream and trends over time. |                           | X                      | X             |

| Task 7 Identify Best Practices for Ultimate Disposition of Discards | Identify “best practices” reporting and monitoring requirements in municipal franchise collection and processing agreements regarding ultimate disposition of materials collected in relation to “highest and best use” hierarchy and residuals landfilled or otherwise disposed at various processing points. |                           | X                          |               |

| Task 8 Recommendations for Improvements and Modifications | Develop recommendations for improvements and modifications indicated in current policies, procedures and practices for the Recycling Board, Alameda County, and the municipalities in order to achieve waste reduction and sustainability goals. Identify outside jurisdictions or organizations successfully engaged in what might be considered “best practices” in municipal waste reduction and sustainability efforts. |                           | X                          |               |

| Optional Task High Performing Multi-Family Organics Programs | N/A |                           |                           | X                          |

### Integration of Tasks

Our scope identifies important connections between the tasks. We will continue to seek to identify these connections as we plan and conduct the work, and welcome StopWaste staff input in this regard. For example, the work for Task 4 (“Identify Metrics”) has connections with Task 2 (“Compile Comparative Data Tables”) and Task 3 (“Compile Diversion Data”), in terms of how the availability, accuracy and reliability of data shapes the choices for metrics. The work for Task 4 (“Identify Metrics”) may also be influenced by the results of the Task 3 (“Compile Diversion Data”) work on “good stuff in the garbage” and Task 6 (“Recoverable Materials in the Disposal Stream”), in terms of the sectors and materials that are prime targets for recovery and for which new metrics may be most useful.
Planning the task work as an integrated whole from the beginning, rather than as a set of individual
tasks will provide for:

- Efficient use of both consultant and StopWaste staff time. For instance, the project meetings
  will be scheduled to include discussion of work across as well as within tasks.

- Improved usefulness of the findings and recommendations by “making the connections”, rather
  than simply listing disparate findings and recommendations.

**Project Meetings**

We have budgeted for a kickoff meeting, for two meetings with StopWaste’s contract manager during
the project work, and two Recycling Board meetings to present the results. The two meetings with
StopWaste staff are included in the fee estimates for Tasks 2 and 6. Since effort in planning for, and
conducting work will occur simultaneously for a number of the tasks, the two project meetings will be
scheduled to meet project needs. In addition, we will be available for regular project status calls and
other coordination with StopWaste’s project manager.

**Scope of Work**

**Task 1 Information Review and Kick-Off Meeting**

We will conduct an initial kick-off meeting with StopWaste staff to review project objectives, establish
communication protocols, finalize project timeline, discuss report submittal process, and discuss key
substantive aspects of the 2017 Review. HF&H will:

- Prepare a draft agenda for review by the StopWaste’s project manager, and finalize for
distribution at the meeting.

- Facilitate the kick-off meeting. Attendees will include our key project staff; other team
  members may participate by phone to conserve budget.

- Prepare summary meeting minutes for StopWaste staff and project team use.

**Deliverables**

- Draft and final meeting agenda.

- Summary meeting minutes.

**Task 2 Compile Comparative Data Tables**

Propose key program parameters and performance metrics to extract from existing data sets and
present a select few tables of comparative data from the member agencies, and compile other data sets
and program profiles from existing and readily available sources.
Understanding and Approach

As provided in the RFP, the level of effort for this task is intended to be significantly lower than for past Reviews. The goal is to compile a limited number of tables with targeted, high-value data, rather than to provide exhaustive profiles of each jurisdictions’ programs. Three years of data from the “Annual Measure D Data Request” forms, including calendar 2015 or FY 15-16 submittals due in October 2016 will form the basis for the compilation of member agency matrices. Our lead analyst for the project is quite experienced with the forms, having completed them for several cities while acting as staff to their franchised collector.

We understand that fourteen of the sixteen member agencies receiving quarterly per capita allocations from the Recycling Fund have submitted data request forms for the last two years. We expect that StopWaste will be able to secure responses from the remaining two agencies. We have significantly reduced the level of effort, relative to prior years, associated with this task on the basis of this data being available. As suggested in the RFP, we plan to conduct one round of contacts to check consistency and accuracy of data, and to fill in missing data as needed on otherwise completed forms. In the event that StopWaste is unable to get this data in the usual format for the appropriate time periods and HF&H is required to do primary data gathering, such effort will be outside of the scope proposed here.

StopWaste staff also collects information from member agencies, such as data regarding construction and demolition debris regulations and practices, commercial recycling controls and programs, Environmentally Preferable Purchasing policies and practices, Bay Friendly Landscaping policies and projects, and other program areas.

The HF&H Team will compile and present readily available and comparable data for up to three other jurisdictions, as agreed upon with StopWaste’s contract manager. In each case, the available data sets may be for one or more specific programs such as C&D debris, or may have a broader program focus similar to that of the member agency data requests. We are also offering a higher level of effort version of this task that would expand this activity.

Scope of Work - Base Level of Effort

For this task, the HF&H Team will:

- Review the submitted member agency data request forms and the other StopWaste datasets. This will include an initial review of the 2012 member agency comparative tables to fully identify data from those tables are not now collected through the data request forms. In some cases this may be entire tables, such as those for customer rates and in other cases may involve just portions of the data in the 2012 tables.

- Propose key program parameters and performance metrics (in conjunction with our work for Task 4 to identify performance metrics) to be included in up to eight matrices. For example, we believe that the municipally-controlled disposal and diversion data and data that allows for performance metrics such as pounds of recyclables per household will be of particular value to include, while the detailed summaries of recycling programs may be of less value at this point in time. We will discuss the proposed key program parameters and performance metrics with StopWaste staff before finalizing the format and content of the matrices.
• Make one round of calls to the member agencies to verify data. We do not anticipate having to perform any surveying or primary data gathering as part of this scope of work. As in the past, we will appreciate a StopWaste staff communication to member agency staff explaining what is needed and to request their timely assistance. We will compile the data from the member agency data requests into the agreed set of tables.

• Compile the member agency data sets for specific programs such as C&D debris, including requesting any necessary verifications while making the data request form verification calls.

• Identify, and discuss with StopWaste staff our candidate jurisdictions that may have other data sets of value, and discuss priorities for the types of data that would be of most use. We will identify, and contact the agreed list of up to three jurisdictions from outside of Alameda County to collect and/or update information, and compile the results, either as separate tables or integrated with the comparable information for the member agencies.

**Deliverables**

- Proposed and final key program parameters and performance metrics.
- Draft and final matrices for other member agency data sets.
- Draft and final summary discussion and tables for data sets from other programs.

**Scope of Work - Higher Level of Effort**

For the higher level of effort, in addition to the activities for the base level of effort the HF&H Team will:

• Expand the collection and presentation of data sets to an additional four jurisdictions from outside of Alameda County. We will again work with StopWaste staff to target the types of data that are of most interest when compared to the member agency data.

• Offer possible modifications to the format and/or content of the data request forms that may improve consistency and accuracy of data reporting based on our experience in completing the forms on behalf of member agencies and working with all of the franchised haulers in the County to get data from their respective information systems. In particular, our suggestions may improve consistency of data as reported by different franchised haulers and enhance comparability of data across all member agencies.

**Additional Deliverables**

- Draft and final summary discussion and tables for additional data sets from other programs.
- Draft and final report language on possible modifications to the data request forms.

**Task 3 Compile Diversion Data**

Compile and present existing metrics of (CalRecycle) diversion rates by jurisdiction, and StopWaste data on “percent good stuff in the garbage.”
Understanding and Approach

We understand that this task has two parts. One part is to compile the CalRecycle diversion rates (pounds per capita and pounds per employee translated into a diversion percentage) for each member agency. The State methodology is used for determining compliance with “75% and Beyond”, and potentially with any future State-imposed local mandate for compliance with “recycling” goals such as that of AB 341. The second part is to compile the Benchmark Service data for “percent good stuff in the garbage” for each member agency, data that is used for measuring progress toward StopWaste’s “percent good stuff in the garbage” goal contained in the “Strategic Workplan 2020”. Each compilation should include concise text explaining the methodology for each type of data, what “counts” as recycling, and the data’s uses and limitations. We will compile the 2015 CalRecycle data, which has just become available on the agency’s website with the comparable data for 2013 and 2014. For the “good stuff in the garbage”, we will compile the 2016 data, which will become available from StopWaste by early in 2017 with the 2013-2015 data summarized in RFP Attachment E.

While some broad and useful conclusions can be drawn from the data, the “good stuff in the garbage” data for 2013-2015 does not demonstrate any clear trends over time. We offer a higher level task that provides for analysis of the 2016 benchmarking data with relation to the prior year data, should the 2016 data appear to indicate multi-year trends worthy of analysis.

Scope of Work – Base Level of Effort

The HF&H Team will compile a set of tables combining the CalRecycle and benchmarking data by member agency as described above in the “Understanding and Approach” section for this task. We will discuss with StopWaste staff how and whether to integrate these diversion data tables with the matrices developed for Task 2. We will also prepare a brief summary discussion for each of the two sets of data, defining the metrics and how they were developed (especially with regard to the CalRecycle measures), how the data is collected, reported and/or calculated, and how it is used.

**Deliverable**
- Draft and final tables, with summary descriptive text.

Scope of Work - Higher Level of Effort

For the higher level of effort, in addition to the activities for the base level of effort the HF&H Team will provide trend analysis of the Benchmarking Service data if the 2016 data appears to add information that would warrant such analysis. If there is interest in this task, we suggest it be included with the project budget, to be spent contingent on consultation with, and approval of StopWaste’s contract manager and the Benchmark Service program manager.

**Additional Deliverable**
- Draft and final text for “good stuff in the garbage” trend analysis.
**Task 4 Identify Key Comparative Metrics**

Propose key metrics that may be used to measure and compare municipal waste reduction efforts in the future, utilizing commonly or easily available data.

Understanding and Approach

The ideal product for this task will be simple metrics that are based on readily available program and demographic data, are easily explained and understood, require a minimum of calculation, and can be built on information that is commonly reported by, or could be reasonably requested from franchise collectors. Our goal is to identify several metrics that individually provide for useful measurement of program effectiveness and comparison between municipal waste reduction efforts by program and/or sector, and that when reported together provide a broader, meaningful comparison by member agency.

Based on our extensive experience working with hauler and jurisdictional data, our initial thoughts for possible metrics include:

- **Residential Sector:** Pounds per capita and/or pounds per household for recycling, garbage, and organics.

- **Multi-Family Sector:** Per-unit “capacity access” of gallons per week and/or cubic yards per week for specific streams.

- **Commercial Sector:** The commercial sector is challenging in that per-employee measures can be useful for specific industries, but are not very illuminating across the entire commercial sector. Per-employee measures may be applicable in the case of commercial organics programs for which a high percentage of the total volume of the material is generated within a small number of business types. Gallons of weekly service may also be of value for specific business types. Both the volumes and the types of service matter. We will seek metrics that could be used to identify situations in which compactor or roll-off service can be converted from garbage to recycling or organics service.

- **Processing:** We will discuss with StopWaste staff the value of metrics related to processing, such as target residue rates that reflect collection mode (e.g., single stream and dual stream recycling, and source-separated and commingled organics) and related type of processing methods for recycling and organics.

Metrics using gallons or cubic yards of service per week can help normalize capacity measures across carts, bins, and debris boxes, and for multi-family accounts may help normalize service across the increasingly complex mix of member agency housing types reflected in individual service with carts, centralized service with bins and boxes, and hybrid variants of the two.

One challenge in identifying each metric will be to ensure that member agencies can collect the underlying data in a consistent matter, from various haulers, and from other data providers and sources such as County parcel, households and unit counts. In our experience, per-unit data for multi-family can be quite challenging with regard to obtaining accurate information and we will consider this to be a useful metric if reliable data can be easily obtained. One likely outcome will be to convey an
understanding of the circumstances under which a metric can or cannot be applied. For instance, organics cart collection may include single-family, multi-family and commercial accounts, making it difficult to isolate a metric for single-family organics pounds per household. Bin collection from multi-family and commercial accounts on a single route poses a similar challenge for isolating desired data. Estimating actual collection volumes from on-call compactor customers is another challenge; customers and haulers may be unwilling to share that information at a detailed level.

A second challenge relates to the application of demographic data to the metrics. For instance, per-household measures will vary across member agencies depending on factors such as the blend of housing types, average persons per household, the minimum number of units defined as “multi-family”, and the extent to which cart sizes for the three streams accurately reflect housing density. While we have not included this approach in our proposed fee estimate, we could use geographic information system (GIS) techniques to normalize based on census data. However, this approach relies on coarse data from the 2010 census and later updates.

We will request input on metrics that program managers with high performing programs, and hauler staff we are engaged with on other projects either use or think would be useful. Our work will be informed by, and draw on the data from the Task 2 and Task 3 matrices, HF&H’s work in franchise contract and diversion performance monitoring, our database of industry information and data from detailed rate reviews and procurement processes, discussion of the commercial sector with the StopWaste Partnership’s program manager, Delyn Kies’ and Kelly Runyon’s many years of business sector work, Kelly Runyon’s broad collection and facility experience as well as his work with the schools program in developing useful metrics (weekly cubic yards of service per one hundred students, etc) and CalRecycle efforts to develop means of measurement and metrics related to AB 341, AB 1826, and if available in time, SB 1383.

We have proposed two levels of effort for this task, with the higher level of effort providing added hours that can be channeled towards adding metrics and/or testing the efficacy of proposed metrics.

**Scope of Work – Base Level of Effort**

The HF&H Team will spend up to a total of 60 hours to identify, and to test the efficacy of possible metrics, with the intent, as noted in our approach, of identifying metrics that provide useful measurement of program effectiveness by program and/or sector, and that when reported together can provide a broader, meaningful comparison by member agency. Kelly Runyon will play a key role on this task. “Testing” will involve using applicable hauler and public agency data from StopWaste's enforcement database, data from our various engagements, as well as industry data from HF&H’s database to determine robustness - the degree to which a given metric can provide meaningful results in a variety of situations and its degree of sensitivity to changes in conditions.

**Deliverables**

- Draft and final metrics descriptions.
- Report text that accompanies the final metrics.
Scope of Work – Higher Level of Effort

For the higher level of effort, in addition to the activities for the base level of effort, the HF&H Team will spend up to a total of an additional 40 hours, which will be focused on further work to identify metrics and/or more rigorous testing of metrics identified through the base level task work. The decision of how to spend the higher level of hours will be made based on consultation with StopWaste staff, and could be made based on the results of the base task work.

Deliverables
- Draft and final descriptive information regarding additional metrics and/or testing.

Task 5 Review Countywide Programs

Broadly evaluate the effectiveness and impacts of countywide waste reduction programs, focusing on the primary areas of discards management, product decisions, and communications.

Understanding and Approach

It is our understanding that the work for this task is intended to be more descriptive than evaluative. We will develop a report section that informs the interested reader regarding the larger context for StopWaste’s programs as well as profiling current and planned activities in each program area. We will also work to emphasize key issues and themes that link StopWaste’s and County’s programs to create a cohesive whole.

We will focus on programs in the following program groups identified in the budget: Product Decisions, Discards Management, and the Communications portion of Communications, Administration and Planning. We will discuss areas of relative emphasis with StopWaste’s contract manager prior to beginning the work. We will interview StopWaste’s managers for the programs within these three program groups. Our team members will review the descriptive text from StopWaste’s FY 2015-16 budget prior to conducting phone interviews with the program managers, and will use the budget material to briefly summarize each program for the report section. We will briefly describe each program’s recent accomplishments, but will focus on current status and future plans.

The interviews will also be used to enhance our understanding of key themes that provide an umbrella for all programs, such as:

- Partnerships with other public and private agencies (e.g. StopWaste Partnership work with member agencies and private businesses, coordinating household hazardous waste (HHW) programs with Alameda County, and litter efforts with stormwater management agencies).
- Leveraging resources (e.g., partnering to share effort and greater focus on seeking grant funding and federal monies such as the EPA grants for the Reusable Transport Packaging Project).
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- Multiple benefits that result from using a program to address more than one media (e.g., the waste reduction, soil health and reduced water usage benefits of Bay-Friendly Landscaping).

- Expanded geographic reach (e.g., the efforts of the Use Reusables Campaign to promote reusable transport packaging in other Bay Area counties).

**Scope of Work**

Delyn Kies and Peter Deibler will serve as task leads, conducting the interviews and drafting the summaries for program staff review and comment. Assignments of lead staff to each primary area and program will be made following consultation with StopWaste’s contract manager to address any possible areas of concern or conflict. However, given the intended descriptive role of the report section, the advantages of having input from team members involved in, and familiar with the programs may outweigh any disadvantages.

**Deliverables**

- Individual write-ups for program staff review.
- Report section of approximately 10 to 15 pages in length.

**Task 6 Comparative Review of Recoverable Material in Disposal Streams**

*Research other states, regions and jurisdictions that have conducted landfill waste characterization studies comparable to those conducted for StopWaste in 1995, 2000 and 2008 (and planned for 2017), and analyze results of overall percentages by weight of commonly recycled and composted materials remaining in the landfill stream and trends over time.*

**Understanding and Approach**

It is our understanding that a key future activity for StopWaste will be the likely revisiting of the “good stuff in the garbage” goal, and the timing for achieving it. StopWaste’s pending waste characterization will help inform this process. The work conducted for this task will provide benchmarks for other programs regarding their relative success in minimizing the amount of good stuff remaining in the disposal stream.

The studies of greatest value will be those that have been repeated at least once so that trends can be identified, for which the most recent characterization was conducted relatively recently, and for which the most recent study reflects a degree of maturity of current programs comparable to those in Alameda County. Based on our initial review, jurisdictions and studies that may be most relevant include Seattle, with a relatively recent characterization, and Hennepin County, Minnesota which is scheduled to release a new disposal characterization this year. We will propose a list of candidate studies and will make the final selection with StopWaste staff input.

We offer two levels of effort for this task. The higher level of effort provides more context for comparing and contrasting collection and processing practices for each jurisdiction, adds more precision to the comparability of results across studies, and provides more detailed comparison matrices. Note that we
have also offered a separate, optional task that can yield useful information regarding contamination in the recycling and organic streams, and that may provide for some useful comparison with data collected by the Benchmark Services program.

**Scope of Work - Base Level of Effort**

The HF&H Team will review up to a total of six waste characterizations, with the list to be finalized through discussion with StopWaste staff. Kelly Runyon will play a key role in leading and conducting the task work. For the base level of effort, the HF&H Team will:

- Finalize selection of the target jurisdictions following discussion with StopWaste's contract manager, and profile the jurisdictions, comparing and contrasting general collection and processing practices for each jurisdiction in a matrix format with regard to a set of six to eight broad factors. This activity will necessarily be more general for statewide or multi-jurisdictional characterizations. Our initial thoughts are to consider factors such as whether program participation is mandatory by sector and the degree of enforcement; if a bottle bill is in place; frequency of garbage collection (weekly or less-than-weekly); recycling program design (frequency of collection; single-stream or dual-stream, by sector); organics program design (frequency of collection; yard trimmings and food scraps collected separately or commingled, by sector); outreach efforts (type and frequency of messaging about use of the correct containers, etc.); relative maturity of programs; and participation and set-out rates for recycling and organics programs (as available). We will contact program staff to address specific questions as needed.

- Compare waste characterization data over time for multiple studies conducted for a given jurisdiction, as well as across jurisdictions. For the base level of effort, the HF&H team will review study methodologies for how the sorts were conducted, and compare descriptions of material classifications between studies at a level that will provide some assurance of relative accuracy. However, this will not necessarily yield a fully accurate comparison. We will identify likely caveats affecting the comparisons.

- Develop matrices comparing study results in a matter that identifies “good stuff in the garbage” for each, based on the level of study review described above.

**Deliverables**

- List of possible characterizations for inclusion in the Review, with the advantages and disadvantages of each.
- Draft and final jurisdiction profiles.
- Draft and final matrices.

**Scope of Work - Higher Level of Effort**

The higher level of effort builds on the work for the base level task, with added activity at each of the three stages of the base level task described above, plus analysis of the targeted results from recent Benchmark Service audits for CVSan and Fremont. For the higher level of effort, the HF&H Team will:
• Enhance the profiles for the target jurisdictions by comparing and contrasting collection practices for each jurisdiction at a greater level of detail, for example adding more specifics to recycling and organics program design such as allowable materials in each program or sophistication of MRF technology as it affects residues, and commenting on how these factors may affect waste characterization results.

• Enhance our review of study methodologies and comparison of material classifications between studies with the goal of yielding more useful comparisons that reflect a relatively high level of accuracy for “good stuff in the garbage” for each program. Individual variations in methodology and in how materials are classified may have small effects, but when combined can have a meaningful impact on the results.

• Develop more detailed matrices comparing study results in a matter that identifies “good stuff in the garbage” from each study, based on the higher level of review that provides more nuance of material classification. However, capturing more detail in the studies included in the Review will allow for more robust comparison with the results of the StopWaste’s upcoming characterization.

• Conduct summary analysis of the results of the disposal stream composition studies from the recent targeted Benchmark Service audits for CVSan and Fremont that, among other things are intended to test the role that messaging can have in moving organics from the garbage cart to the organics cart.

**Deliverables**

• Draft and final jurisdiction profiles, with added detail.
• Draft and final matrices, with added detail.
• Draft and final summary of the CVSan and Fremont audits.

Possible Added Task: While we have not provided a scope of work or budget for it, a possible additional task related to Task 6 (and Task 3) is to evaluate the results of targeted sorts of recyclables, organics, MRF residues, etc, that high-performing jurisdictions have conducted to address specific issues related to programs and/or facility operation. This task could yield useful information regarding contamination in the recycling and organic streams - “wrong stuff in the diversion streams” – and may provide for some useful comparison with data collected by the Benchmark Services program. The intent would be to determine whether and how the results can be used to inform programs and target facility residue rates. Examples include San Jose’s recent MRF residue sorts to determine collection and processing contract compliance (conducted under a master services agreement managed by Peter Deibler), the periodic recycling sorts conducted by the three participants at the SMaRT Station (Sunnyvale, Mountain View and Palo Alto) to determine revenue share, and Palo Alto’s contract provision for twice-per-year recyclables sorts and once-per-year organics sorts. If this task is of interest, we would be glad to discuss it with StopWaste staff.
Task 7 Identify Best Practices for Ultimate Disposition of Discards

Identify “best practices” reporting and monitoring requirements in municipal franchise collection and processing agreements regarding ultimate disposition of materials collected in relation to “highest and best use” hierarchy and residuals landfilled or otherwise disposed at various processing points.

Understanding and Approach

In general, it has been very challenging for individual public agencies that are users of a shared recovery facility, whether for recycling or organics to determine their individual level of contamination/residue and the ultimate disposition of materials once they are delivered. Once materials have left a primary processing location for secondary (or tertiary) levels of processing there is generally even less opportunity to know what is occurring. Historically, some contracts provided for public agency auditing at post-primary stages, most typically in the context of recyclables revenue sharing to determine if per-unit revenues are competitive. But now most jurisdictions opt for simplicity, providing contractors the full benefit of recycling revenues as an offset to processing costs and thus obviating the need for auditing. Similarly, most organics processors produce a range of products for different markets that reflect material quality and composition. But given competitiveness of markets, pricing confidentiality and relatively low per-unit revenue, few contracts have provided for any type of revenue share.

For member agencies, an initial step is to understand the management practices at the facility in terms of how different types of incoming loads are directed and what sort of recovery occurs for each type of material and at each location. This understanding can provide some assurance that primary level processing achieves anticipated results. Facility operators generally report a facility-wide diversion rate, with residue disposal tons pro-rated to each user. Some contracts provide for a maximum facility-wide residue rate, which if exceeded may trigger review of collection and/or processing practices to identify the issue, or provide for minimum recovery levels for specific collected streams. Failure of contractual language to distinguish contamination from residue can result in confusion. As a second step, collection, or collection and processing contracts may include provision for conducting periodic targeted sorts of the residue resulting from processing just that jurisdiction’s incoming material to determine a jurisdiction-specific recovery (or residue) rate. But such sorts are expensive, and contract language must be well thought through. For instance, one member agency has a profit sharing arrangement in which the city is paid a fixed payment for every ton of delivered recyclables using a tiered scale tied to residual levels. Unfortunately the agreement does not provide adequate detail regarding definition of “contamination” and “residue”, or for how sorts are to be conducted. In some cases, as little as two cubic yards of material are sorted to determine contamination rates for a whole community. We are aware of instances in which this type of process has been applied at the secondary level, as with secondary processing of mixed glass. In these situations, the primary processor’s initial residue rates may later be increased to include contamination charges levied against the primary processor by the secondary processor. However, member agencies are in the best position to try to do so if they use a publicly-owned facility for primary processing.

The 2016 passage of AB 901, with formal rulemaking and the online reporting system to be developed and finalized in late 2017 has the potential to change, hopefully in a positive manner, the ability of member agencies to understand the ultimate disposition of materials. On the one hand, facilities will now report directly to CalRecycle rather than to counties, there will be expanded reporting requirements for recycling and composting operations and facilities including transporters, exporters,
and brokers covering both quantities and material types (which have never been subject to such reporting) and CalRecycle will have enforcement authority. On the other hand, AB 901 eliminates the requirement that recycling facilities identify the county of origin for the recycled material they handle. We are tracking AB 901 implementation, and will use that knowledge to inform our work on this task. However, the first reporting period will be Q1 of 2018, and much about the impact of the legislation will only really become clear after analysis of several quarters of the data.

Scope of Work

For Task 7, the HF&H Team will identify, and profile up to four instances in which the types of practices described above in the approach have been successfully applied or likely could be applied with modification. Potential examples from the Bay Area include:

- The periodic recycling sorts conducted by the three participants at the SMaRT Station (Sunnyvale, Mountain View and Palo Alto) to determine revenue share, Palo Alto’s provision for twice-per-year recyclables sorts and once-per-year organics sorts.

- San Jose’s targeted MRF sorts (incoming and outgoing) to determine collection and processing contract recovery compliance, the provisions of San Jose’s commercial collection processing contracts governing allocation of organics, as well as lessons from member agency agreements.

Based on our understanding, and interviews with up to five relevant public agency staff and facility operators, we will describe the mechanism, provide examples of contract language, identify what has or has not worked and why, and the range of cost of providing for such measures. We will also provide a brief description of how AB 901 may improve understanding of post-collection activity as the rule making process unfolds.

**Deliverable**

- Draft and final report sections.

**Task 8 Recommendations for Improvements and Modifications**

Develop recommendations for improvements and modifications indicated in current policies, procedures and practices for the Recycling Board, Alameda County, and the municipalities in order to achieve waste reduction and sustainability goals. Identify outside jurisdictions or organizations successfully engaged in what might be considered “best practices” in municipal waste reduction and sustainability efforts.

Understanding and Approach

HF&H will develop initial draft recommendations identifying any significant gaps and areas for improvement. The draft recommendations will reflect the outcomes of each of the above tasks, with a focus on “best practices”, including identifying additional practices of note for high performing jurisdictions discussed in other tasks. HF&H will circulate the initial draft for review and comment by our team members, and will incorporate changes prior to producing a final draft for review and comment by
StopWaste’s project manager. The final version will address StopWaste staff comments and will be included in the draft report.

Scope of Work

Peter Deibler will be the lead staff for compiling our findings and recommendations, but all senior team members will contribute based on the specific tasks they led as well as reviewing an internal draft of the findings and recommendations.

**Deliverable**

- Recommendations for inclusion in the draft and final reports.

**Task 9 Draft and Final Reports**

HF&H will prepare and submit a draft report, and will incorporate StopWaste’s comments to produce a final report. We assume receipt of one consolidated set of comments. We also anticipate sharing drafts of specific report sections with the StopWaste’s project manager prior to his receipt of the draft report as a means of ensuring that the deliverables meet client expectations.

Mr. Deibler will compile the draft sections developed for each task into a cohesive whole.

**Task 10 Board Presentations**

We anticipate two presentations to the Board and/or committees to be conducted either after submittal of the draft report or of the final report, based on discussion with StopWaste staff.

**Optional Task – High Performing Multi-Family Organics Programs**

Understanding and Approach

The multi-family disposal stream constitutes about eleven percent of the total disposal stream in Alameda County, and is a much higher percentage for some of the member agencies. The challenges of creating, and more importantly, sustaining effective multi-family diversion programs are well documented. Among the related barriers for multi-family organics programs are:

- Effective outreach that provide meaningful messages to specific communities.
- Growing participation with minimal increased cross-contamination.
- Creating in-unit convenience through use of pails and clear messaging about acceptable bag types.
- Providing convenience with collection logistics that match the needs for given complexes in terms of cart and bin placement.
• The availability of ongoing technical assistance.

Scope of Work

The HF&H Team will spend up to 40 hours to identify source-separation programs that have created successful best practices in one or more aspects of program design, implementation and follow-through, such as San Francisco and Global Green’s door-to-door outreach efforts in Albany (since expanded to Contra Costa, San Mateo, and Los Angeles counties). We will contact municipal staff for Bay Area jurisdictions we work with that have recently developed or enhanced multi-family organics programs, such as Mountain View and Daly City to identify any best practices. We will also review and follow-up on information from a variety of resources such as CRRA and NCRA conference presentations. In each instance we’ll identify the benefits and in some cases added cost that may come with given best practices.

Deliverable
Draft and final report sections.

Schedule

The table on the following page is a detailed proposed schedule for the project. The schedule assumes the contract is executed in mid-December, as provided in the RFP. We propose to conduct the project in within nine months and to submit the final report by mid-September of 2017. We will then work with you to schedule the two Board presentations. We do not anticipate any significant changes to the schedule due to the addition of any of the higher level tasks or of the optional task. We are flexible regarding the schedule, should StopWaste wish to discuss any modifications.
## StopWaste Section 4: Scope of Work

"5 Year Program Review" Proposal

### StopWaste.Org

#### FIVE YEAR PROGRAM REVIEW - 2017

**2017 Programmatic Review**

#### Estimated Project Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notice to Proceed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prepare For and Attend Project Kick-off Meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Background Information and Prepare Agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Kick-Off Meeting; Draft Summarized Minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compile Comparative Data Tables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Member Agency Submittals; Propose Key Program Parameters and Performance Metrics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Verification Calls; Compile Tables of Comparative Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile Other Data Sets and Program Profiles; Meeting with StopWaste Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compile Diversion Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile CalRecycle Diversion Rate Data; Draft Accompanying Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile &quot;% Good Stuff in Garbage&quot; Data; Draft Accompanying Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify Key Comparative Metrics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and Propose Metrics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test and Finalize Metrics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review of Countywide Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Materials, Interview Key Staff and Prepare Write-Ups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparative Review of Recoverable Material in Disposal Streams</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize Jurisdiction Studies; Profile Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare Waste Characterizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile Data; Meeting with StopWaste Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify Best Practices for Ultimate Disposition of Discards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Industry &quot;best practices&quot;: MSW reduction &amp; sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations for Improvements and Modifications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and Propose Improvements and Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop Reports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Draft Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Final Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Presentation, Attend, and Present at Two Meetings of Recycling Board (TBD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 5: COST PROPOSAL

This section includes our cost proposals and our fee schedule. The following tables provide three options:

1. A proposed total budget of $79,850 for the base level of services.
2. A proposed total budget of $88,330 that includes the base level of services plus the higher level of effort for Tasks 2 and 4.
3. A proposed total budget of $112,700 that includes the base level of services plus the higher level of effort for Tasks 2, 3, 4 and 6, and the optional task.
### Option 1: Base Level Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Prepare For and Attend Project Kick-off Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Background Information and Prepare Agenda</td>
<td>0 4 0 0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Kick-Off Meeting; Draft Summarized Minutes</td>
<td>4 6 4 0 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 1</strong></td>
<td>4 10 4 0 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 2</th>
<th>Compile Comparative Data Tables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Member Agency Submittals; Propose Key Program Parameters and Performance Metrics</td>
<td>2 8 20 0 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Verification Calls; Compile Tables of Comparative Data</td>
<td>0 4 16 16 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile Other Data Sets and Program Profiles; Meeting with StopWaste Staff</td>
<td>0 12 8 8 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2</strong></td>
<td>2 24 44 24 94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 3</th>
<th>Compile Diversion Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compile Cal-Recycle Diversion Rate Data; Draft Accompanying Text</td>
<td>0 4 8 4 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile &quot;% Good Stuff in Garbage&quot; Data; Draft Accompanying Test</td>
<td>0 6 12 4 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 3</strong></td>
<td>0 10 20 8 38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 4</th>
<th>Identify Key Comparative Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify and Propose Metrics</td>
<td>4 6 12 1 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test and Finalize Metrics</td>
<td>2 6 6 1 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 4</strong></td>
<td>6 12 18 2 38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 5</th>
<th>Review Countywide Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Materials, Interview Key Staff and Prepare Write-Ups</td>
<td>0 16 0 0 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 5</strong></td>
<td>0 16 0 0 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 6</th>
<th>Comparative Review of Recoverable Material in Disposal Streams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalize Jurisdictions/Studies; Profile Programs</td>
<td>0 4 12 0 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare Waste Characterizations</td>
<td>2 4 4 0 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile Data; Meeting with StopWaste Staff</td>
<td>0 4 6 6 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 6</strong></td>
<td>2 12 22 6 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 7</th>
<th>Identify Best Practices for Ultimate Disposition of Discards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 6 18 0 24</td>
<td>$3,720 0 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 7</strong></td>
<td>0 6 18 0 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Task 8: Recommendations for Improvements and Modifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identify Industry &quot;best practices&quot;: MSW reduction &amp; sustainability</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$2,220</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Task 9: Develop Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identify Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop Draft Report</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$6,440</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Final Report</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$4,060</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 9: 8 16 8 10 72 $13,520 4 4 8 $960 80 $14,480

## Task 10: Board Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prepare Presentation, Attend, and Present at Two Meetings of Recycling Board</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$6,040</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 10: 8 16 0 4 28 $6,040 0 0 0 $0 28 $6,040

## Total Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>Out-of-Pocket Expenses</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>$146</td>
<td>$154 $54 $384 $65,960</td>
<td>$66,210 $13,640 $79,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# StopWaste Section 5: Cost Proposal

## Alameda County Source Reduction and Recycling Board “5 Year Audit” Proposal

**Option 2: Base Level Tasks Plus Higher Level of Effort for Tasks 2 and 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Prepare For and Attend Project Kick-off Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Background Information and Prepare Agenda</td>
<td>Vice President: 0, 4; Senior Manager: 0, 0; Associate: 4, 0; Administrative: 4, 4;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Kick-Off Meeting; Draft Summarized Minutes</td>
<td>Vice President: 4, 6; Senior Manager: 4, 4; Associate: 0, 0; Administrative: 0, 0;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 2</th>
<th>Compile Comparative Data Tables - Higher Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Member Agency Submittals; Propose Key Program Parameters and Performance Metrics</td>
<td>Vice President: 0, 8; Senior Manager: 20, 0; Associate: 0, 0; Administrative: 0, 0;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Verification Calls; Compile Tables of Comparative Data</td>
<td>Vice President: 0, 4; Senior Manager: 16, 16; Associate: 36, 0; Administrative: 0, 0;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile Other Data Sets and Program Profiles including from 4 Additional Jurisdictions; Meeting with StopWaste Staff</td>
<td>Vice President: 0, 12; Senior Manager: 8, 8; Associate: 28, 4; Administrative: 4, 0;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Possible Format and/or Content Modifications to the Data Request Form</td>
<td>Vice President: 2, 4; Senior Manager: 12, 2; Associate: 20, 2; Administrative: 0, 2;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 3</th>
<th>Compile Diversion Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compile Cal-Recycle Diversion Rate Data; Draft Accompanying Text</td>
<td>Vice President: 0, 4; Senior Manager: 8, 4; Associate: 16, 0; Administrative: 0, 0;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile &quot;% Good Stuff in Garbage&quot; Data; Draft Accompanying Text</td>
<td>Vice President: 0, 6; Senior Manager: 12, 4; Associate: 22, 0; Administrative: 0, 2;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 4</th>
<th>Identify Key Comparative Metrics - Higher Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify and Propose Metrics</td>
<td>Vice President: 4, 8; Senior Manager: 16, 1; Associate: 29, 0; Administrative: 0, 0;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test and Finalize Metrics</td>
<td>Vice President: 2, 8; Senior Manager: 12, 1; Associate: 23, 0; Administrative: 0, 0;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 5</th>
<th>Review Countywide Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Materials, Interview Key Staff and Prepare Write-Ups</td>
<td>Vice President: 6, 16; Senior Manager: 28, 2; Associate: 52, 0; Administrative: 0, 0;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 6</th>
<th>Comparative Review of Recoverable Material in Disposal Streams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalize Jurisdictions/Studies; Profile Programs</td>
<td>Vice President: 0, 4; Senior Manager: 12, 0; Associate: 16, 0; Administrative: 0, 0;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare Waste Characterizations</td>
<td>Vice President: 2, 4; Senior Manager: 4, 0; Associate: 10, 0; Administrative: 0, 0;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile Data; Meeting with StopWaste Staff</td>
<td>Vice President: 0, 4; Senior Manager: 6, 6; Associate: 16, 0; Administrative: 0, 0;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 7</th>
<th>Identify Best Practices for Ultimate Disposition of Discards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President: 0, 6; Senior Manager: 18, 0; Associate: 24, 0; Administrative: 0, 0;</td>
<td>HFH Sub-Total Hours: 0, 0; Cost: $3,720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Task 8: Recommendations for Improvements and Modifications

Identify Industry "best practices": MSW reduction & sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 8</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$2,220</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$2,580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Task 9: Develop Reports

Identify Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 9</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$3,020</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Develop Draft Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 9</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$6,440</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$6,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Develop Final Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 9</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$4,060</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$4,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Task 10: Board Meetings

Prepare Presentation, Attend, and Present at Two Meetings of Recycling Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 10</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$6,040</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$6,040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Total Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labor Hours</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>$70,840</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>$17,040</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>$87,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-Pocket Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>$71,090</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$88,330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Option 3: Full Scope Including All Higher Level and Optional Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vice President</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>HFH Sub-Total</th>
<th>Delyn Kiss</th>
<th>Kelly Amynen</th>
<th>Subs Sub-Total</th>
<th>Combined Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>Prepare For and Attend Project Kick-off Meeting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$920</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review Background Information and Prepare Agenda</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attend Kick-Off Meeting; Draft Summarized Minutes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$3,820</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>Compile Comparative Data Tables - Higher Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$4,440</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review Member Agency Submittals; Propose Key Program Parameters and Performance Metrics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$4,440</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make Verification Calls; Compile Tables of Comparative Data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$4,520</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compile Other Data Sets and Program Profiles including from 4 Additional Jurisdictions; Meeting with StopWaste Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$3,160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify Possible Format and/or Content Modifications to the Data Request Form</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>$16,560</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>Compile Diversion Data - Higher Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$2,320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compile Cal-Recycle Diversion Rate Data; Draft Accompanying Text</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compile &quot;% Good Stuff in Garbage&quot; Data; Draft Accompanying Text</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$2,960</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct Trend Analysis for GSIG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$8,580</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>Identify Key Comparative Metrics - Higher Level</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$5,010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify and Propose Metrics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$3,990</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test and Finalize Metrics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td>Review Countywide Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$3,680</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review Materials, Interview Key Staff and Prepare Write-Ups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$3,680</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6</td>
<td>Comparative Review of Recoverable Material in Disposal Streams - Higher Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$2,940</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finalize Jurisdictions/Studies; Profile Programs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$2,660</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compare Waste Characterizations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$2,960</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compile Data; Meeting with StopWaste Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$2,180</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of Benchmark Service Audit Disposal Composition</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$10,740</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Task 7: Identify Best Practices for Ultimate Disposition of Discards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 7</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 6 18 0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$3,720</td>
<td>0 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 1</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$3,840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Task 8: Recommendations for Improvements and Modifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 8</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify Industry &quot;best practices&quot;: MSW reduction &amp; sustainability</td>
<td>0 4 10 0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$2,220</td>
<td>2 1 3</td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$2,580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Task 9: Develop Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 9</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations</td>
<td>0 12 2 0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$3,020</td>
<td>2 2 4</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Draft Report</td>
<td>4 16 8 8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$6,440</td>
<td>2 2 4</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$6,920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Final Report</td>
<td>4 8 8 2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$4,060</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$4,060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Task 10: Board Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 10</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Presentation, Attend, and Present at Two Meetings of Recycling Board</td>
<td>8 16 0 4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$6,040</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$6,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Optional Task - MFD Organics Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional Task</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify and Profile High-Performing MFD Organics Programs; Identify Best Practices</td>
<td>2 12 16 2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$5,520</td>
<td>6 4 10</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$6,720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Total Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>Out-of-Pocket Expenses</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 180 206 58 484</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$83,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 196 240</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HFH Sub-Total</th>
<th>Delyn Kies</th>
<th>Kelly Runyon</th>
<th>Combined Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$210</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget assumptions:

- Billings will be based on the not-to-exceed total for the project, rather than by task.
- Additional meetings sessions generally range in cost from $600 - $1,500 depending on length and number of staff.
- Agency staff will assist HF&H in meeting the schedule by providing timely data and other information, review of draft materials, scheduling of meetings and phone calls, etc.

### Personnel Assignments and Base Level Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Billing Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rob C. Hilton</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Deibler</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>$230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Collins</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>$130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Erwin</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Runyon</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delyn Kies</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>496</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimated Monthly Billings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Estimated Billings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional Fees

Hourly rates for professional and administrative personnel are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>$270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Vice President &amp; Vice President</td>
<td>$250 - $269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Project Manager</td>
<td>$230 - $235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Associate/Project Manager</td>
<td>$195 - $219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Analyst</td>
<td>$130 - $170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Analyst</td>
<td>$110 - $130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Staff</td>
<td>$105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direct Expenses

Standard charges for common direct expenses are as follows:

- Automobile Travel
- Document Reproduction: 15 cents per page (black & white), 75 cents per page (color)
- Facsimile: No charge
- Telephone: No charge
- Public Conveyances: Actual
- Postage: Actual
- Overnight Mail and Couriers: Actual

Billing Policies

Our policy is to bill for our services and direct expenses based on the standard hourly rates of the staff member assigned, multiplied by the time required to perform the client-related tasks, plus the subcontractor services as described above. In implementing this policy we adhere to the following practices:

- It is our standard practice to e-mail invoices to our clients, although hard copies of invoices can be sent to clients on request.
- We round to the nearest one-half hour (e.g., if two hours and 50 minutes are spent on a task, it is recorded as three hours, if two hours and 10 minutes are spent on a task, it is recorded as two hours). A minimum charge of one-half hour is charged for any client work performed in a day.
- We attempt to schedule travel time before and after normal work hours and we do not bill for this time. If travel occurs during normal work hours and we can use public conveyances, we attempt to use the time productively for the benefit of the client or for another client and this time is billed to the appropriate client. If we must travel during business hours and cannot use the time productively or use a public conveyance, we bill the time to the client on whose behalf we are traveling.
- Because public meetings (e.g., Board of Supervisors, City Council, and Board of Directors meetings) generally occur after business hours and are not conducted in accordance with strict schedules, our standard policy is to bill a minimum two-hour charge.
We do not markup out-of-pocket expenses, however, we may charge administrative or professional time related to the provision of the goods and services associated with these charges. Mileage fees are based on the round-trip distance from the point of origin. If a client's change to a previously scheduled meeting results in penalties being assessed by a third party (e.g., airline cancellation fee), then the client will bear the cost of these penalties.

While no minimum fee for a consulting engagement has been established, it is unlikely (given the nature of our services) that we can gain an understanding of a client's particular requirement, identify alternatives, and recommend a solution in less than twenty-four hours.

**Insurance**

We maintain the following policies of insurance with carriers doing business in California:

- Comprehensive General Liability Insurance ($2,000,000)
- Workers’ Compensation ($1,000,000)
- Professional Liability Insurance ($2,000,000)
- Hired and Non-Owned Auto Liability ($1,000,000)

All costs incurred in complying with special insurance, licensing, or permit requirements, including but not limited to naming client as an additional insured and waiver of subrogation, become the responsibility of the client and are not included in the fees for services or direct charges but are billed in addition to the contract at cost, plus any professional or administrative fees.

**Invoices and Payment for Services**

Our time reporting and billing system has certain standard formats that are designed to provide our clients with a detailed invoice of the time and charges associated with their engagement. (We typically discuss these with our clients at our kick-off meeting.) We are also pleased to provide our clients with a custom invoice format but we will have to bill the client for any additional costs associated with their unique requirements.

Billings for professional services and charges are submitted every month, in order that our clients can more closely monitor our services. A late fee of one and one-half percent per month is applied to balances unpaid after thirty (30) days.
REQUIRED CONTRACT ELEMENTS:
INSURANCE POLICIES AND STATEMENT OF ECONOMIC INTEREST

Request for Proposal (RFP) for Alameda County Recycling Board “5 Year Program Review”
Released August 18, 2016

It is a requirement of the Alameda County Waste Management Authority and the Source Reduction and Recycling Board that any individual or firm selected to provide consultant services maintain the following minimum insurance during the term of the professional services contract. The individual or firm selected as a consultant must obtain the following insurance policies:

A. Comprehensive general liability insurance, including personal injury liability, blanket contractual liability, and broad-form property damage liability coverage. The combined single limit for bodily injury and property damage shall be at least $2,000,000.

B. Automobile bodily injury and property damage liability insurance covering owned, non-owned, rented, and hired cars. The combined single limit for bodily injury and property damage shall at least $1,000,000.

C. Statutory workers’ compensation and employer’s liability insurance as required by state law with a limit of at least $1,000,000 per accident for bodily injury or disease. Neither Contractor nor its carrier shall be entitled to recover any costs, settlements, or expenses of workers’ compensation claims arising out of this agreement. The Employer’s Liability policy shall be endorsed to waive any right of subrogation against the Agency, its employees or agents.

D. Professional Errors and Omissions Liability Insurance. The limit of liability shall be at least $1,000,000. If the policy is written on a “claims made” basis, Contractor must maintain required coverage for a period of three years after the expiration of this agreement. Contractor may satisfy this requirement by renewal of existing coverage or purchase of either prior acts or tail coverage applicable to said three-year period.

In addition, the individual or firm’s project manager may be required to submit a Statement of Economic Interest Form (Form 700) as required by the State Fair Political Practices Commission. For a copy of a Form 700, please see the California Fair Political Practices Commission website at http://www.fppc.ca.gov

Please sign the statement below to indicate that you and your firm understands and will comply with the Alameda County Waste Management Authority’s and the Source Reduction and Recycling Board required insurance policies and will submit a Statement of Economic Interest Form if requested by StopWaste staff.
I have reviewed the "Required Contract Elements" information above and certify that my firm has the ability to obtain the required insurance policies and submit the Statement of Economic Interest Form. The professional fee schedule submitted to the Agency includes any costs associated with complying with these insurance requirements.

I understand that failure to comply with any of these requirements will result in the Agency’s refusal to enter into a contract for services with my firm.

Signature: ___________________________ Date: 10/7/16

Name: Robert C. Hilton

Title: Vice President

Firm/Team Name: HF&H Consultants, LLC
Range of Experience

Since 2002, Rob Hilton has provided recycling and solid waste consulting services to public agencies in projects covering a wide range of strategic, operational, programmatic, contractual, and financial issues. Mr. Hilton’s background in public policy and administration and his involvement in over 290 projects for more than 110 agencies throughout the United States, gives him an understanding of the diverse conditions within the industry as well as the local market context that shapes each client’s unique needs.

Mr. Hilton has assisted communities throughout the state in the process of developing strategic plans to achieve their high diversion or zero waste goals. In developing these plans, Mr. Hilton uses an analytical approach that involves benchmarking existing programs, identifying areas for improvement separate from programs that need to be replaced, estimating both the diversion potential as well as cost for programs and facilities, identifying infrastructure opportunities and gaps, and developing a strategy for phasing in programs so that the community will realize the greatest program- and cost-effectiveness. This analytical approach results in diversion plans that are more effective in developing the necessary community and political support to make them work. Mr. Hilton has used this analytical approach to develop high diversion or zero waste plans for the cities of Beverly Hills, Livermore, Milpitas, Mountain View, Pasadena, San Diego, San Leandro, Santa Monica, and the County of Kern.

In addition, Mr. Hilton has presented several papers to industry organizations on the subject of how to develop sustainable funding strategies that support your zero waste system. These papers are the result of research and projects conducted by HF&H on behalf of clients like the Alameda County Waste Management Authority, Monterey Regional Waste Management District, Kern County, the City of San Diego, and Sonoma County; all of whom have high diversion goals but fund their programs largely off of landfill disposal.

Professional and Business History

HF&H Consultants:  Vice President, 2013 to Present;
               Senior Project Manager, 2010 - 2013;
               Senior Associate, 2008-2010;
               Associate Analyst, 2005-2008;
               Assistant Analyst, 2002-2005

Sandia National Laboratories: Internet and Database Integration Specialist, 1999 - 2002

Professional Organizations

President, Board of Directors, California Resource Recovery Association (CRRA)

Solid Waste Association of North America (SWANA)

Institute of Management Consultants (IMC)
Detailed Staff Résumés

Robert C. Hilton, CMC, Vice President

American Management Association (AMA)

Articles and Speeches


“Funding Recycling Programs & Infrastructure in California”, California Resource Recovery Association Trade Show and Conference, August 2015

“The Future of Resource Recovery in the MRWMD”, SWANA Western Regional Symposium, April 2015

“Fighting the Zero Waste Death Spiral”, SWANA Western Regional Symposium, April 2015


“Funding Recycling Programs in California”, Institute for Local Government Webinar, December 2014

“Structuring Rates in High Diversion Communities”, SWANA Webinar, October 2014


Presenter, HF&H/CalRecycle High Diversion Rates & Compensation Workshops, October 2013 (Oakland), November 2013 (Lakewood), and December 2013 (Sacramento)


“RFP It and They Will Come: Structuring Contracts for Organics”, California Resource Recovery Association Trade Show and Conference, August 2013

“Funding, Franchise Agreements, and Facilities: A Perfect Storm”, SWANA WasteCon, August 2012

“Collaborative Workshop on Zero Waste Funding”, California Organics Recycling Council Workshop, August 2012

“Economics of Food Collection Programs”, California Resource Recovery Association Trade Show and Conference, August 2012

“Realigning Monterey’s Landfill Status as a Sustainability Leader”, SWANA Western Regional Symposium, April 2012


“Implementing Mandatory Commercial Recycling”, Southern California SWANA Workshop, April 2011 and SWANA Western Regional Symposium, May 2011

"Mandatory Commercial Recycling Cost Study", Coachella Valley Association of Governments Solid
Waste Task Force, January 2011
"Improving Materials Management in Historic Old Sacramento", California Resource Recovery Association Trade Show and Conference, August 2010
“Funding Alternatives for Zero”, California Resource Recovery Association Trade Show and Conference, August 2009
“Contracting for Organics”, Central Valley Bi-Annual Recycling Roundtable, October 2008
“Moving Beyond Disposal - Funding Options for High Diversion”, Presentation to the Alameda County Source Reduction and Recycling Board, July 2008 (Co-Presenter)

**Education and Professional Certification**

B.A., Political Science/Public Administration, University of California, Davis
Certified Management Consultant, Institute of Management Consultants USA
This page intentionally left blank
Range of Experience

Mr. Deibler is a Senior Manager with HF&H Consultants, with over 30 years of experience in the waste management field. He has a background in resource economics and has assisted dozens of public sector clients. Mr. Deibler specializes in policy, process, financial and legal issues related to diversion programs and waste management program and facility procurements and negotiations. He frequently drafts and negotiates service contracts and is well versed in local government setting of fees and rates. His work often involves public process and facilitating decision making by senior staff and elected officials. He is a frequent presenter on a range of topics.

Current and recent clients include the City and County of San Francisco, StopWaste.Org (Alameda County), the Sacramento Regional Solid Waste Authority, the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD), the cities of San José, Sacramento, San Diego, Milpitas, Mountain View, Daly City, Sunnyvale, Palo Alto, Tracy, Oxnard, the West Valley Solid Waste Management Authority (four Santa Clara County cities), and Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Sacramento and San Joaquin counties. Key current and recent responsibilities include: development of an organics processing RFP and design/build agreement for Santa Cruz County; managing a multi-consultant team for San José under a three year master services agreement to assist with the city’s residential program; competitive and sole source collection and facility operations procurement processes for the cities of Milpitas, Sunnyvale, Daly City, Oxnard, Tracy and Alameda; developing a MRF and anaerobic digestion facility design/build/operate agreement for Santa Barbara County; acting as “Rate Payer Advocate” representing the interests of San Francisco rate payers during the city’s rate review and adjustment process; assisting EBMUD with an RFP process for pre-processing of commercial food scraps prior to anaerobic digestion; modeling HHW program and sustainable funding options for StopWaste.Org in support of a now adopted new parcel fee; Zero Waste planning and negotiation of a new service agreement for Mountain View; and assisting the City of San Jose’s commercial redesign procurement including collection and anaerobic digestion of organics. Other past clients include the cities of Palo Alto, Oceanside and Sausalito; Sonoma, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties. Recent presentations and panel moderation include diversion planning and contracting-related sessions at CRRA’s 2010, 2012 and 2014 annual conferences, and SWANA webinars scheduled for November and December 2015.

Professional and Business History

HF&H Consultants, LLC: Senior Project Manager, 2006 to Present
Brown, Vence & Associates: Vice President, Senior Associate, 1989 - 2006

Recent Articles and Speeches

“Negotiating for Results – Positioning for Success”, California Resource Recovery Association Annual Conference, Sacramento, August 9, 2016


“Success in Negotiating High Diversion Programs”, SWANA Webinar, with Tracy Swanborn, HF&H, November 4, 2015
Peter Deibler, Senior Project Manager

“Success in Negotiating High Diversion Programs – Competitively and Sole Source”, California Resource Recovery Association and SWANA Joint Conference, San Jose, August 4, 2014


Ratepayer Advocate, Testimony and cross-examination provided at six rate setting hearings, City and County of San Francisco Department of Public Works and Rate Board, April through July 2013


“High Diversion with a Redesigned Commercial Program,” with Kristina Gallegos, City of San José, California Resource Recovery Association Conference, Sacramento, August 9, 2010

“Moving Beyond Disposal - Funding Options for High Diversion”, Presentation to the Alameda County Source Reduction and Recycling Board, July 10, 2008

“Rethinking Rate Structures - Rate Setting for High Diversion”, Presentation to the Alameda County Source Reduction and Recycling Board, April 10, 2008

Education

M.A., Energy and Resources, University of California, Berkeley

B.A., Economics, Phi Beta Kappa, Beloit College
Range of Experience

Mr. Collins is a recent addition to our staff at HF&H. He brings 11 years of prior financial and accounting experience as well as seven years of diverse experience in the solid waste industry. While in the private sector, he spent more than two years managing municipal contracts, creating outreach programs, and providing technical assistance for commercial and multi-family customers in the cities of Albany, Emeryville, Newark, and San Ramon. Ben also received invaluable insight into implementing city zero waste programs and addressing customer concerns during his 18 month internship with the City of San Francisco’s Department of the Environment Zero Waste Team. While at the Department of the Environment, Mr. Collins worked with multi-family property owners, manager, and residents to implement recycling and composting as part of the city’s Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance. Ben performed countless hours of public outreach in San Francisco including door-to-door outreach with tenants, presentations to the San Francisco Apartment Association, and site trainings with property managers and facilities staff. In his native Oklahoma, Ben was a member of a select Citizen’s Taskforce where he led many public meetings and a 700 person phone survey during a two year process to develop the State’s first Residential Pay-As-You-Throw collection system and the City of Tulsa’s first Residential collection update in over 30 years.

Professional and Business History

HF&H Consultants, LLC: Associate Analyst, 2016 to present
Waste Management of Alameda County: Public Sector Manager, 2015 to 2016; Recycling Representative, 2013 to 2015
Cascadia Consulting Group, Inc.: Waste Auditor, 2014
San Francisco Department of the Environment: Residential/Multi-family Zero Waste Intern, 2012 to 2014
Green Cities California: Researcher, 2012 to 2013
City of Tulsa: Refuse and Recycling Taskforce Member, 2010 to 2012

Professional Organizations

Northern California Recycling Association (NCRA: 2013 to Present)
Zero Waste Youth USA (2013 to 2015)
Tulsa Master Recyclers Association (TMRA: 2009 to 2012; Event Recycling Committee Chair 2010 to 2012)
Education and Professional Certification

M.S.E.M., Environmental Management, University of San Francisco, San Francisco (in progress)
M.B.A., Business Administration, University of Tulsa, Tulsa
B.A, Film Studies, University of Tulsa, Tulsa
**Range of Experience**

Ms. Erwin has a breadth of experience encompassing every aspect of HF&H’s operations. Ms. Erwin is responsible for proofing and editing the majority of documents that leave our Walnut Creek office. Kim handles all IT services for HF&H’s Walnut Creek and Irvine offices and maintains our company website. Ms. Erwin is responsible for reviewing insurance requirement in client contracts and ensuring compliance. She handles the prompt filing of all Fair Political Practices Commission Form 700s for staff and for the member agencies of the West Valley Solid Waste Management Authority (WVSWMA). Ms. Erwin coordinates the scheduling and prepares Board packets for each Board member for the WVSWMA.

Ms. Erwin has gathered and analyzed data to determine the sustainability of ACWMA’s current practices related to their solid waste tonnage and recycling programs, as well as their energy and water consumption. Kim Erwin played a significant role in collecting the information for the Franchise Task Force Database Project and assisted in the evaluation of residential and commercial recycling programs for StopWaste.Org’s 2007 5-Year Audit.

Ms. Erwin has assisted on many other solid waste and recycling projects including: surveying of rates and programs for comparability for several dozen municipalities in the state; providing procurement support to the City of Milpitas, Santa Barbara County, and several other clients. Kim is currently assisting with a zero waste plan for the County of San Diego.

**Professional and Business History**

HF&H Consultants, LLC: 2005 to Present

OfficeTeam: Administrative Specialist, 2003 to 2005

The Steele Foundation: Executive Assistant, 2002 to 2003

Koff & Associates: Human Resources Technician, 2000 to 2002

**Education**

Currently working toward a B.S. in Business Administration

A.A., Legal Studies, Heald Business College
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Delyn Kies, Owner and Principal, Kies Strategies

Resume

Ms. Kies has over 30 years of experience in the environmental management field with a primary focus in the area of integrated solid waste management. She has a broad range of experience in all facets of solid waste management including collection, transfer, transportation, disposal, anaerobic digestion, facility siting and public education. She has particular expertise in waste reduction including commercial recycling and composting, environmental purchasing, waste prevention, household hazardous waste, and construction and demolition debris recycling programs.

As a consultant and as a former solid waste manager for both Washington County and the City of Portland, Oregon, Ms. Kies has worked extensively with local and state governments and trade organizations. She has managed landfills, administered collection service permits and franchises, and designed and implemented jurisdiction-wide recycling collection, processing and education programs. She is skilled and experienced in program design and implementation, public policy development, technical assistance and outreach, and community relations.

Ms. Kies has assisted industrial and commercial businesses in designing and implementing effective strategies for reducing and recycling their wastes in order to control their costs and to proactively respond to public sector priorities, initiatives, and regulations. She has worked with associations and communities to develop healthy recycling markets and recovery programs and to undertake long-term planning efforts directed at sound resource management and the improvement of financial control systems.

She participated in the drafting and legislative adoption of the 1983 Oregon Recycling Opportunity Act and the 1991 Oregon Recycling Act. She has been an active member and served in leadership positions for the Solid Waste Association of North America, Association of Oregon Recyclers, and the National Association of Women in Construction. She is a member and former board member of the National Recycling Coalition, serving as Vice President in 1995 and as Chair of the 35-member board in 1996.

Relevant experience consists of three decades of research and analysis, conducting public participation, and developing and implementing waste management alternatives for a wide range of communities in the western United States.

Selected Project Experience

- Solid Waste Management System and Facilities Plans - Performed research and analysis, provided senior technical review, made public presentations, and managed numerous projects to prepare local solid waste management and implementation plans in Wyoming, Oregon, California, Nevada, Hawaii, Colorado, Alaska, New Mexico and Washington State. Ms. Kies has completed Solid Waste Management System and Facilities Plans for jurisdictions including Kalaupapa, and Hawaii and Kauai Counties, Hawaii; Crook, Lane and Wheeler Counties, Oregon; Clark County, Nevada; the Pueblo of Isleta, New Mexico and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation. She completed a comprehensive Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan for the U.S. Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the solid waste and recycling component of the East Yosemite Valley Site Study, and an Integrated Solid Waste Alternatives Plan for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Kies Strategies
Novato, California
415/209-0321 / delyn@kies-strategies.com
Key components of these plans were recycling, composting, source reduction, buying recycled, education and outreach, and methodologies to track progress. Tasks included facilitation and work with regulators, elected officials, technical staff, the media, local businesses, and citizen groups.

- Household Hazardous Waste Management Plans, Nineteen Oregon Counties – Prepared Plans for eighteen Oregon Counties since 2000. Provided senior technical review in the preparation of a Plan for an additional County in 2004. Plans include a *review of local conditions, a needs assessment, analysis of management options* including staffing and estimated costs for facilities and events, funding mechanisms, an outreach plan, and measurements for program effectiveness. The planning process includes developing and conducting public involvement for determining plan elements and support for adoption.

- City and County of San Francisco - Key member of the consultant team providing *recycling, composting, environmental purchasing and waste prevention technical assistance to businesses and institutions* in partnership with SF Environment staff and private collectors since 2003. Her efforts have resulted in documented new and ongoing diversion from landfill disposal.

- StopWaste (Alameda County Waste Management Authority) – Member of the consultant team providing *recycling, composting, energy efficiency, water conservation and waste prevention technical assistance to businesses and institutions* in Alameda County from 2002-2011. Ms. Kies served as the resource specialist for environmentally preferable purchasing, green operations and maintenance practices, and construction & demolition debris recycling. *Ms. Kies led an initiative to develop relationships and improve results from multi-tenant properties* in partnership with the Building Owners and Managers Association of Oakland/East Bay, including the establishment of the organization’s Environment Committee.

- StopWaste (Alameda County Waste Management Authority) – Member of the staff and consultant team assisting member agencies and businesses in Alameda County in the *purchase of recycled content and environmentally preferable products* since 2001. Ms. Kies is also assisting the Agency’s Green Building Program in researching recycled content building materials standards, certifications and availability in the marketplace.

Ms. Kies also served as temporary staff for both the StopWaste business assistance program and the environmentally preferred purchasing program during the program manager’s leave from November 2011 - August 2012.

- StopWaste (Alameda County Waste Management Authority) – Ms. Kies provides strategic research and analysis for waste prevention policies and programs for the Agency, most recently completing the *Paperless Express, a paper use reduction guide for businesses*.

- StopWaste (Alameda County Waste Management Authority) – Member of the consultant team performing the 5-year review of diversion programs and trends for each of the 17 member agencies and Alameda County-wide programs. Ms. Kies’ contributions included technical review of alternative funding options, measurement of recycling and diversion, and approaches to mandatory recycling and to local and regional landfill bans based on review of programs from around the country. She also conducted interviews and research and prepared reports summarizing new information and applicability of commercial packaging reduction efforts for Alameda County, *tools*
for predicting diversion opportunities (recycling, reuse and waste prevention) by industry types and by materials, and key findings for private sector recycling and market trends.

• Lane County, Oregon – Managed and completed a Waste Reduction Technical Review of solid waste systems within the Lane County wasteshed in 2011-12. The review was required by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality to identify gaps and improvements in waste reduction programs. Research, interviews and surveys were conducted to assess the effectiveness of current efforts and identify possible methods of increasing the wasteshed-wide recovery rate. A report was prepared that included data analysis, key findings and detailed evaluation of recommended programs.

• Metro, Oregon – Identified and evaluated best management practices including targeted generators and waste streams, probable tonnage diversion, feasibility of implementation, and implementation cost. Thirty-two best management practices were identified and evaluated, categorized by Construction & Demolition, Organics, Commercial, Residential, Multi-Family, Outreach and Education, and Market Development. The results of the project were used to convey to the Agency’s elected councilors the range of "best" waste reduction and recycling practices that have already been adopted in the Portland metropolitan region and which ones might be adopted.

• Metro, Oregon - In 2010, Ms. Kies conducted research and assisted in preparing reports for two Metro projects: (1) researching and recommending cooperative program opportunities with local building code officials to increase salvage, reuse and recycling of building materials from permitted construction and demolition projects and (2) developing an outreach plan and tools for increasing waste reduction and recycling in the medical sector. Key elements of the process included outreach, interviews and focus groups with targeted stakeholders.

• Metro, Oregon – Completed interviews, research and analysis of business recycling technical assistance and outreach programs of local governments in the Metro region and selected programs across the country to make recommendations that will best meet the regional program’s goals for increased business participation and diversion.

• Fort Collins, Colorado – Member of consulting team that developed a solid waste reduction 5-year strategic plan for the City. Lead on tasks to perform (1) research and analysis on waste diversion measurement methodologies, and (2) research and analysis of program options to identify new opportunities for waste reduction and recycling including construction and demolition debris processing requirements, landfill bans and incentives.

• Pitkin County, Colorado – Member of consulting team that developed program strategies for a comprehensive solid waste master plan for this County that includes the City of Aspen. Lead on tasks to identify, develop and analyze strategies for permit fees or deposit incentives for construction & demolition debris recycling; procurement requirements, incentives, tools and assistance with a special focus on transportation agency procurement incentives; office paper waste prevention; recycling enclosures; household hazardous waste; recycling parks; in-vessel composting; and reduced tipping fees. Evaluation was based on research of experience elsewhere and analysis of applicability for Pitkin County.

• Shea Homes - Worked with this developer to meet an 80% recycling requirement for the demolition of 1,200 vacated military housing units at the former Hamilton Army Airfield in Novato, CA from...
2000-2005. Subsequently assigned similar tasks for deconstruction and demolition of buildings at the former Fort Ord for the Marina University Villages development in Monterey County, CA.

- Marion County, Oregon - Assisted as the sustainability consultant for the Courthouse Square project, a mixed-use development in downtown Salem, Oregon. Work was conducted with County staff and the design team to review the original conceptual design, identify existing sustainability features, and incorporate additional sustainability features into the final design and construction. As a result of this facilitation and involvement, the project was one of the first buildings in the Pacific Northwest to be awarded LEED Green Building certification. Also worked closely with the demolition and construction contractors to assure high levels of materials recovery, and earlier in the project conducted an extensive review of material options containing recycled content. After the project was completed, a case study was prepared to document and promote the County’s accomplishments.

- Recycling Certification Institute – As a Lead C&D Facility Evaluator, Ms. Kies has conducted quarterly sampling events since June 2015 at the Davis Street Transfer Station’s construction and demolition (C&D) recycling facility. The purpose is to provide an independent, third-party observation and documentation of the facility’s operation and recycling diversion rate.

- LEED Waste Audits – Conducted numerous LEED-compliant waste audits since 2009 at multi-tenant commercial buildings in the Bay Area for property management companies including Shorenstein Realty Services, Cushman & Wakefield and CBRE, among others. Prepared documentation and worked closely with clients’ LEED consultants to assure compliance.

**Memberships**
Northern California Recycling Association
California Resource Recovery Association
Association of Oregon Recyclers (past board member; past chair)
National Recycling Coalition (past board member, vice president and chair of the board)
National Association of Women in Construction (past chapter board officer)
Marin Builders Association (advisory committee to board of directors)
Sonoma County Recycling Association (board member)
Marin County AB 939 Local Task Force (past vice chair)
Marin Food Scrap Recycling Task Force
Marin Conservation League
Sustainable Novato (board member)
Kelly Runyon

Independent Consultant

Mr. Runyon has over 35 years of experience in waste management and materials recovery design and operations. His work has included the planning and management of waste diversion efforts directed at businesses, multifamily complexes and schools in Alameda County and throughout the Bay Area. He applies his skills in Excel and database software, as well as Geographic Information Systems software, to plan and manage projects of this type. Typically this has involved working with large data sets such as haulers’ customer lists and service records, to identify the most appropriate and receptive targets among all of the customers in a community.

In addition, his experience includes:

- Conducting waste characterization studies at scales ranging from single locations to entire counties.
- Serving as adjunct staff to public agencies requiring special expertise in waste diversion planning and engineering.
- Managing recycling and transfer operations, as well as facility planning and design, for a major California hauler.

After retiring from Environmental Science Associates (ESA) in 2015, he has continued to provide consulting services to companies and jurisdictions that are pursuing unique, high-performance approaches to reducing and diverting solid wastes.

**Relevant Experience**

**Franchise Agreement Compliance Annual Report, Livermore Sanitation.** *Analysis, Project Management.* Beginning in 2011, with the first year of its refuse and recycling services franchise, Livermore Sanitation, Inc. (LSI) was required to submit an annual report to the City of Livermore describing its efforts to meet the commercial and multifamily waste diversion goals in that agreement. To provide objectivity, LSI chose an outside firm to prepare the report. Mr. Runyon both managed the report preparation and provided detailed analysis of LSI’s records, comparing actual activities to requirements and goals. This work has been repeated for five consecutive years.

**Less-Than-Weekly Refuse Collection Pilot Program, Castro Valley Sanitation District.** *Study Design and Analysis.* For this innovative effort to reduce landfilled waste from the residential sector, Mr. Runyon is providing data recording, mapping and analytical work in an effort to determine if this voluntary residential pilot program is causing an increase in diversion by participants. He is also providing liaison with Stopwaste’s Benchmark program, which is generating household-level waste characterization data in the pilot study area.

**Franchise Implementation Support, City of Oakland.** *Monitoring and Evaluation.* For the franchise agreements that took effect in Oakland in mid 2015, Mr. Runyon is reviewing the franchisees’ proposed methods to measure their waste diversion levels. He is also observing the diversion performance tests required by the agreements, and reviewing their reports and calculations.

**EDUCATION**

M.S., Mechanical Engineering, University of California, Berkeley

B.S., Mathematics, Michigan State University

GIS coursework, San Francisco State University Extension
School Recycling Program Design, Zero Waste Marin. Management and Reporting. In 2014 and 2015, Mr. Runyon and colleagues at ESA carried out a survey of school recycling programs throughout Marin County. The objective was to identify the most successful existing waste diversion methods and the most prevalent unmet waste diversion needs, and recommend ways to apply local best practices to increase diversion. After this project was completed, the agency has begun putting the recommendations into practice in 2016.

Contra Costa County: County Government Recycling Program Evaluation and Monitoring. Analyst. In 2015, staff at the County’s Department of Conservation and Development requested assistance in evaluating the effectiveness of the County’s in-house recycling program. This program had grown in a piecemeal fashion over the years, with a limited ability to measure recycled quantities and a lack of uniformity of services. Mr. Runyon provided methods for standardizing the measurement of performance, based on the many existing methods of estimating recovered quantities, for services ranging from health care to road work.

Comprehensive Commercial Recycling Program Implementation Technical Assistance, San Francisco Department of the Environment (SFE). Project Manager. Beginning in August 1996, Environmental Science Associates (ESA) provided direct, in-person technical assistance, training, outreach, follow-up, troubleshooting, and monitoring to over 2,600 commercial businesses and institutions in San Francisco. ESA coordinated these activities with staff at Recology SF, the Department of the Environment (SFE), and targeted businesses and institutions. Through 2015, while on ESA staff, Mr. Runyon provided staff coordination, waste characterization, facility audits, and statistical analyses to support SFE’s efforts to increase recycling and reduce waste citywide.

Commercial Recycling Technical Assistance, City of Hayward, CA. Management and Reporting; Staff Coordination. Managed ESA and subcontractors’ activities to increase recycling participation at more than 750 businesses throughout the City of Hayward. Primary activities were one-on-one outreach to local businesses, providing advice and assets to help reduce disposed wastes. The City’s goals were met, on time and within budget.

Community Monitor, Altamont Landfill, Livermore, CA. Management, Monitoring and Report Review. From 2008 through 2016, Mr. Runyon has served as the landfill’s Community Monitor, reviewing all data and reports submitted by the landfill to regulatory agencies, and reporting quarterly to the Community Monitor Committee. He conducts monthly site inspections and maintains a web site as a repository for reports and background information.
Castro Valley Sanitary District  


Project Description
CVSan, with support from StopWaste.Org, are interested in exploring the effects of Less-Than-Weekly (LTW) garbage collection, coupled with effective and ongoing outreach and education, which are anticipated to have positive impacts for material collected in all three carts. With regard to the organics cart, food scrap programs have historically provided relatively little in the way of recovery. Food scrap participation rates in Alameda County, even with mature food scraps programs in most of the jurisdictions, have ranged from about 15 percent to 35 percent. For many communities, there is little interest in enforcing mandatory separation programs for single-family customers and reduced garbage collection frequency could provide the means to significantly motivate participation in residential food scrap programs, contributing to the manifold benefits of getting organics out of landfills. An effective LTW program should also result in less cross-contamination between the landfill and recycling carts, as well as less putrescibles in each, helping achieve StopWaste.Org’s goal of no more than 10% of the “wrong stuff” in each cart.

HF&H Solution
HF&H was hired by CVSan to manage the LTW garbage pilot program, assisted by Delyn Kies and Kelly Runyon. The pilot program is scheduled for June 1 through December 31, 2016 and includes portions of two routes with 400 households each, and a control route. HF&H designed the methodology for the program and data collection process, and is coordinating with CVSan’s communications and outreach consultant, managing a subcontractor providing pilot program field work and data collection, beginning analysis of the results, and will prepare a final report. In addition, we played a lead role in developing and negotiating a memorandum of understanding with Waste Management pertaining to the definition of the routes to be included in the pilot and the control route, the type of operational data to be collected and provided by Waste Management, and additional customer service capabilities needed to respond to residents’ questions. StopWaste.Org is conducting three analyses of set-outs and garbage composition analysis for the three routes, with the second completed in September 2016.

Our key goal is to maximize the value of the pilot for CVSan as it assesses its programming and service delivery options for its customers. In addition, we want the results of this effort to have significant value for the many other local agencies and service providers that are hopeful about the ability of this tactic to provide stimulus to participation in their food scrap programs, and to possibly save money. How the pilot is conducted will set a precedent for similar pilots and full scale programs for other StopWaste.Org member agencies and other communities throughout California.

Project Results
Project results will be available in Spring 2017.
City of Berkeley Commercial Franchising Study (2014-15)

Project Description
The City of Berkeley (City) is one of few cities in California that operates its own waste management services, as well as owning and operating a transfer station. The City provides collection of refuse, recyclables, and organics for residential and commercial customers. In addition, the City has franchise agreements with five waste management companies that authorize and restrict them to haul rubbish (dry trash) from commercial customers. In 2015, the City identified the need to upgrade its “complicated, cumbersome, and difficult to administer” commercial franchise system to a system that would be both administratively efficient and support the City’s zero waste goals, and engaged HF&H to aid it in this effort.

HF&H Solution
The City faced several complications that needed to be considered and balanced in developing a strategy for the future commercial system. Specifically, the City was receiving approximately $841,000 per year in franchise fees that supported critical services like residential street sweeping and graffiti abatement. Furthermore, the City was funding approximately $3 million per year in services to commercial customers (e.g. street sweeping, sidewalk steam cleaning, public litter container collection, etc.) and the zero waste fund contributed significantly to other internal service activities and general fund departments.

HF&H identified five potential options for the future of the commercial system: (1) City Provides All Commercial Services; (2) City Provides All Service but Roll-Off; (3) Single Exclusive Franchisee; (4) Multiple Non-Exclusive Franchisees; and, (5) City Franchises Recyclables Collection. HF&H analyzed each of these options for impacts to the Zero Waste Fund, General Fund, staffing, required acquisition or sale of assets, the City’s Zero Waste Goal, customer service, cost of service, and street/road and traffic impacts. In addition, HF&H had extensive discussions with City staff to receive input on operations, rate structure, customer relations, and coordination with franchisees. Consideration for these findings was incorporated into the analysis.

Project Results
The City Council voted to approve the option wherein the City would provide all commercial refuse and recycling services except roll-off containers and compactors. Based HF&H’s analysis, this option will result in the following:

1. Net increase in commercial revenue of $196,000 per year.
2. Retained franchise fee revenue of $599,000 per year.
3. 6 new employees are hired.
4. Increased control and measurement of recycling-related activities.
5. Reduced vehicle trips, emissions, traffic, and road impacts.
City of Mountain View Zero Waste, Negotiation and Rate Modeling (2011-16)

HF&H has recently conducted four related projects for the City of Mountain View (City).

Zero Waste Plan
In February 2011, the City Council selected HF&H to prepare a Zero Waste Plan (Plan). The HF&H team included ESA Inc., Kies Strategies, and Steven Sherman Consulting. The planning process was distinguished by use of HF&H’s industry database to model diversion impacts and costs for selected new and modified services. The process included public meetings and surveying, developing a detailed baseline analysis of current programs, and coordination of processing needs with the cities of Sunnyvale and Palo Alto, the three users of the SMaRT Station. The Plan was put on hold while the City’s attention turned to developing and negotiating a new agreement.

New Agreement
In June 2011, the City Council elected to conduct a sole source RFP and negotiation process with Recology for a new 7 year term, with a focus on increasing diversion. In September 2012, Council awarded the Recology agreement, praising staff’s efforts and the process and noting that provision of HF&H benchmark data provided added assurance that a new sole source contract with Recology was in the city’s best interests. Working closely with staff from 3 departments, HF&H assisted in defining the process, reviewing options for rate setting and compensation adjustment, and developed a “mini-RFP”, a draft collection agreement and a term sheet for an organics processing agreement. The RFP required proposals for “base services” (current services with relatively minor changes) and for six “zero waste services”. The zero waste services selected for the RFP were developed through the zero waste planning process and presentation of draft Plan materials to the Council. HF&H assisted City staff in developing a sophisticated means for addressing effective delivery of residential services to a wide range of housing types – a challenge faced by many California communities with significant infill and mixed use. HF&H assisted with evaluation of Recology’s proposal, using our benchmark database to assess cost and operational efficiency, our detailed zero waste planning analysis to review zero waste services, and analyzing G&A expenses and regional and corporate allocations to the local affiliate.

Cost of Service and Rate Modeling
In late 2011, the City requested HF&H conduct a cost of service study and model alternative rate structures addressing diversion incentives and meeting city attorney compliance concerns regarding Propositions 218 and 26. HF&H worked with Finance and Public Works Department staff to project an annual revenue requirement and allocate it to customer classes based on cost of service, and developed a range of rate scenarios for City consideration. The user-friendly model is being used by City staff for diversion planning and fiscal management. In early 2015, HF&H updated the model to reflect actual expenses and revenues for Fiscal Years 2011-2013.

Every-Other-Week Garbage
HF&H is currently assisting city staff in evaluating the results of the city’s recent every-other-week (EOW) pilot and in negotiating program changes and compensation with the hauler. Negotiations are based on program design and cost information form the agreement which in turn, resulted from the earlier zero waste planning effort.

Client Contact
Lori Topley
Solid Waste Program Manager
(650) 903-6488
ATTACHMENT C: ADDITIONAL PROJECT WRITE-UPS AND REFERENCES

City of San José  Commercial Organics Processing (2007-12)

Project Description
In 2007, the City of San José adopted a set of “Green Vision Goals” designed to transform San José over 15 years into a center of clean technology innovation and sustainable practices. Among the goals was a Zero Waste goal of diverting 100% of municipal solid waste from landfills and of converting waste to energy. The City quickly realized that to achieve such a goal required significantly increasing commercial diversion performance. The non-exclusive commercial collection system was yielding a diversion level of about 23%

HF&H Solution
The City of San José chose HF&H to assist them in identifying options for redesigning the commercial solid waste management system for an excess of 8,500 commercial accounts. First, HF&H analyzed the existing collection system to better understand the level of each hauler’s involvement and their role in diversion. Second, HF&H worked closely with the City’s commercial team to prepare the organics processing and collection RFPs.

The organics processing RFP encouraged a range of processing options from composting to AD and other innovative processes.

Project Results
• The City selected Republic Services to provide pre-processing of organics as collected from the “wet” container in a wet/dry system, and ZWED to develop an AD facility at the City’s wastewater treatment plant, and composting and marketing of the resulting material.

• The ZWED facility is the first application of this specific technology at this scale, and for processing of material in the United States. While being a technology leader comes with some risk, the City was willing to accept this risk as part of accomplishing its Green Goals.

• Three party arrangements can pose a challenge, with the need for ongoing coordination between the collector, the processor and the city. The City has worked closely with both parties to reduce specific contaminants - especially glass – in the AD feedstock.

• Recovered ammonia, used as a feedstock for fertilizers has proven to be a significant part of the facility’s revenue stream.

• The ZWED facility uses modular units with capacity for 45,000 TPY each, helping to reduce cost and minimize risk for all parties.

• Organics AD processing helped the City achieve its goal of increasing diversion from the commercial sector from 23% to over 75%.

Client Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Anderson</td>
<td>Commercial Program Manager</td>
<td>(408) 975-2518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Young</td>
<td>Organics Manager</td>
<td>(408) 975-2519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Zientek</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Environmental Services</td>
<td>(408) 535-8557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
County of San Diego  High Diversion (Zero Waste) Plan (In-progress)

Project Description
HF&H has been retained by the County of San Diego to assist in developing a strategy for reaching a 75% diversion goal by 2020 and Zero Waste by 2040. The County’s current diversion level is 62%. The geographic range of the unincorporated area and diversity of the population and the industries pose challenges to designing a High Diversion/Zero Waste Plan that is customized to these types of differences. Gaining the support of the community and the Board of Supervisors for the County’s Plan is essential to realize the County’s goals.

HF&H Solution

- HF&H will develop an actionable Plan with a realistic program/policy timeline with priorities set based on a logical cost-benefit analysis. A key piece of our approach is development of a funding strategy for start-up and on-going program/policy costs with phased implementation. The planning effort has commenced with assessment of the current conditions in the County including an inventory of current programs and policies and an infrastructure inventory of reuse, recycling, composting, transfer, and landfill facilities.

- We are compiling and analyzing waste composition data, tonnage data, and hauler account information as well as County collection, processing and disposal data for the County’s internal operations. Our scope includes development of a large menu of program and policy options and short-listing the options using a set of screening criteria.

- We will assess the diversion potential, costs, GHG impacts, job creation potential, and other factors for the short-listed programs and use these factors, as well as input from stakeholders, to identify programs and policies to be included in the recommended set of actions.

- We have planned and are in the process of facilitating over 15 meetings with residents, businesses, haulers, industry parties, and several County departments. Our team is in the process of preparing educational materials including a website, press releases, and public notices to inform stakeholders about the process and encourage participation in the various meetings.

Project Results
In May and June 2016, materials presented to stakeholders will be available and will outline preliminary program and policy options. A draft High Diversion (Zero Waste Plan) will be available in late 2016 and is anticipated to be finalized in January 2017.
City of San Diego Long Term Options and Zero Waste Plan (2006-14)

Project Description
The City of San Diego Environmental Services Department is responsible for collection services to residents, a variety of recycling programs and disposal services at the Miramar Landfill, which at the beginning of the project was scheduled to close between 2012 and 2016. As a result, the City was seeking to develop a strategic plan for its long term waste management options.

HF&H Solution
- During Phase I of the project, HF&H assisted in projecting demand and evaluating alternatives as part of preparing a 25-year strategic plan for the City.
- HF&H evaluated the City’s waste management needs, focusing on the following factors: population and waste stream projections by waste shed; permitted facility capacities and planned expansions; program projections and facility needs to address future waste stream requirements; and financial models to evaluate various zero waste programs.
- Phase II involved updating the projected system demand and capacity analysis through 2045, preparing a financial model through 2045, and evaluating potential funding strategies for the alternative programs.

HF&H was then engaged by the City to lead and facilitate the Zero Waste planning effort.

- HF&H worked with Environmental Services staff to document the baseline policies, programs, facilities, and behavior change strategies currently employed by the City in order to understand what was working and what could be improved.
- From that baseline, HF&H and City staff developed a strategy for the additional policies, programs, facilities, and behavior change strategies that the City could and would take on in order to achieve the goal.
- HF&H and City staff then spent several months doing an iterative series of stakeholder workshops to get input on the options the City would take ownership of and to identify other options that stakeholders would adopt (nearly doubling the list of tactical approaches to be employed towards the goal).

Project Results
The City’s goal of 75% by 2020 and Zero Waste by 2040 and the strategic plan to achieve the goal were adopted unanimously by the City Council. Environmental Services staff are now taking primary responsibility for the phased implementation of the strategic plan, with occasional assistance from HF&H and others on certain elements. In addition, the plan successfully identified and engaged nearly a dozen community and non-profit partners that have adopted and are working to implement additional measures that will support the plan.