



**DATE:** November 10, 2016

**TO:** Planning & Organization Committee/Recycling Board

**FROM:** Wendy Sommer, Executive Director

**BY:** Tom Padia, Deputy Executive Director

**SUBJECT:** Award of Contract for Five Year Program Review

---

### **SUMMARY**

In both May and August the Recycling Board discussed the scope of work and budget for the County Charter-required Five Year Program Review, directing staff to pare down the scope to decrease focus on comparative evaluation of past performance, increase focus on forward looking best practices and metrics, and reduce the budget to under \$100,000. Five proposals were received and reviewed by a team of senior staff. Interviews of three finalists were conducted by a panel consisting of senior RB and member agency staff. Staff recommends award of contract to the team led by HF&F Consultants, LLC, with Kelly Runyon and Delyn Kies as subcontractors.

### **DISCUSSION**

Measure D requires a comprehensive financial, statistical and programmatic audit and analysis to be performed within four years of the effective date of the Act and every five years thereafter. (Actual text from this section of the Charter is included as Attachment A.)

For some time now the Board has separated the financial/compliance review from the programmatic evaluation and has conducted separate solicitation and selection processes for each. The current Five Year Financial & Compliance Audit for FY 11/12–15/16 is underway by Crowe Horwath and should be completed around the end of this fiscal year.

Program reviews have typically included summary profiles comparing local program features and results to each other and to other well-regarded and “model” waste reduction programs nationwide. The last Program Review five years ago cost approximately \$144,000. Additionally, the scopes of work for the past several Five Year Program Reviews have included tasks to research one or more topics or issues of current relevance to Alameda County’s waste reduction efforts and goals.

The scope for this RFP asked consultants to use existing data sets to extract and present key program parameters and performance metrics for member agency diversion programs, to propose key metrics to measure and track future municipal waste reduction efforts, to identify best practices used in tracking the disposition of diverted materials, to broadly evaluate countywide waste reduction programs, and to research and present findings of the “percent good stuff in the garbage” in other high-performing jurisdictions that have conducted recent waste characterization studies. Finally, the consultant is asked

to develop recommendations for StopWaste and the member agencies to improve waste reduction performance, and identify other high performing jurisdictions that we might look to as models. The full RFP is Attachment C.

**Budget:**

The approved FY 16/17 budget includes \$181,000 in originally-projected hard costs based upon a base contract of approximately \$150,000 and a contingency of \$30,000. Funds for the Five Year Program Review come from the Grants to Non-Profits revenue stream, which allows funding for "...planning, research and studies directed at furthering the purposes of this Act." (Subsection 64.060(B)(2)). Any cost savings for this project will be returned to the Grants to Non-Profits fund balance.

The HF&H proposal is for a "base" budget of \$79,850 and optional higher levels of effort on four of the tasks totaling an additional \$26,080 plus an optional task for an additional \$6,720. The recommended scope and contract award includes a higher level of effort on two of the tasks for an additional \$8,480, or a total of \$88,330. The higher level of effort on Task 2 includes recommendations on revisions to the content and format of the current data request form submitted annually by member agencies in order to improve consistency and accuracy, as well as adding data from four outside-the-county jurisdictions to the comparative data tables profiling member agency programs. The higher level of effort on Task 4 adds 40 more hours (to the base level of 60 hours) for the development of key comparative metrics for future program tracking. While "value" rather than absolute price was the primary criteria for evaluation, the HF&H recommended scope and budget for \$88,330 came in as the lowest of all (five) proposals. Additionally, the HF&H team scored highest among the reviewers and interview panel for breadth and depth of experience.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Recycling Board approve award of contract for the Five Year Program Review to HF&H Consultants, LLC per the attached proposal in an amount not-to-exceed \$88,330 from the Five Year Audit project in the FY 16/17 budget and authorize the Executive Director to execute a contract for proposed services, subject to approval as to form by legal counsel.

Attachment A: Subsection 64.040: Recycling Policy Goals and Recycling Plan

Attachment B: Proposal from HF&H Consultants, LLC ([Click Here](#))

Attachment C: Request for Proposals dated August 18, 2016 ([Click Here](#))

## ATTACHMENT A

Following is the text from Measure D relating to the comprehensive audit:

### SUBSECTION 64.040: RECYCLING POLICY GOALS AND RECYCLING PLAN

- C. The Recycling Board shall contract, not more than four (4) years after the effective date of this Act, and then every five (5) years thereafter, for an audit to determine compliance with the Recycling Plan and the degree of progress toward the recycling policy goal then in effect. Said audits shall be conducted by an independent auditor (or auditors) with experience in source reduction and recycling. The reports of said audits shall be completed within one (1) year and issued to each municipality, the Board of Supervisors and the Authority. Said reports shall include at least the following:
1. A narrative and analytical evaluation of all recycling programs within Alameda County, whether funded through this Act or not, both Alameda County-wide and within each municipality;
  2. A statistical measure of the progress toward the recycling policy goal then in effect;
  3. An evaluation of the Recycling Board's activities, including, but not limited to, an accounting of the monies spent by the Recycling Board; and
  4. Recommendations to the Recycling Board, the Board of Supervisors, the Authority and the municipal governing bodies for the maintenance and expansion of recycling programs, and any necessary resulting amendments to the Recycling Plan.