DATE: August 11, 2016

TO: Planning & Organization Committee/Recycling Board

FROM: Wendy Sommer, Executive Director

BY: Tom Padia, Deputy Executive Director

SUBJECT: Scope of Work for Five Year Program Review

SUMMARY

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.) At the August 11 Planning & Organization Committee/Recycling Board meeting, staff will present and seek approval for a proposed “pared down” scope of services for the next program audit as previously requested by the Board.

DISCUSSION

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. Staff is developing the Request For Proposals (RFP) for the next program audit, and at the May 12 meeting discussed with the Recycling Board the proposed schedule and scope of the RFP. The Board gave staff direction to scale back the scope of work for the next Five Year Program Review, and to reduce the proposed budget from the $150,000 range to $100,000 or less. Board members suggested the report focus less on profiles of past performance and more on recommendations for “best practices” going forward. It was requested that staff return in a few months with a proposed scaled back scope, the scope of work for the last RFP five years ago for comparison, and a link to the last report.

The current Five Year Financial & Compliance Audit for FY 11/12–15/16 is underway by Crowe Horwath and should be completed by the end of this fiscal year. The last Five Year Program Audit (hereinafter to be called “Five Year Program Review”) was performed by SAIC and is available at: http://www.stopwaste.org/sites/default/files/Documents/5_year_audit_6-28-13.pdf.

The report prior to that was performed by HF&H Consultants in two volumes and is available at:

http://www.stopwaste.org/sites/default/files/revised_assessment_report-final_1-08.pdf

http://www.stopwaste.org/sites/default/files/Documents/revised_member_agency_program_summaries_appendix_1-08%20%281%29.pdf
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. Cost of the last Program Review five years ago was 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.

**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 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.

**Proposed “Pared Down” Scope of Work:**

The Scope of Work from the December 2011 RFP is included as Attachment B. Since the time of the last Five Year Program Review, staff has begun asking the member agencies to file an “Annual Measure D Data Request” along with the annual Measure D financial report (sample of the Data Request included as Attachment C). While the financial report details Recycling Fund revenues and expenditures, the data report includes information on municipal contracts, tonnages collected, and account subscription information. Fourteen of the sixteen member agencies receiving quarterly per capita allocations from the Recycling Fund have submitted these data requests for the last two years. A new request will be issued at the end of August with the next quarterly allocations.

Staff has not devoted significant resources to reviewing these submittals for consistency and accuracy, but they could be used as a basis for profiling member agency programs in the Five Year Program Review without a large level of new effort by a consultant. Similarly, staff collects information periodically from member agencies regarding their 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.

By extracting certain key program parameters and performance metrics from existing data sets, the Five Year Program Review could present a select few tables of comparative data from the member agencies, and compile other data sets and program profiles with a minimum level of back and forth communication with fourteen cities and two sanitary districts. Profiles of municipal programs outside of our county can be dropped, and research tasks on additional issues can be limited to one or two high priority topics. Finally, the RFP can state a budget ceiling and proposers can be asked to “back into” a budget maximum with their proposed level of effort.

In line with this scaled down budget, the following scope outline is proposed for inclusion in the RFP:

- Profile residential recycling program parameters (e.g. materials collected, frequency, size and type of containers) and results (e.g. pounds per household, pounds per capita, etc.) in each Alameda County municipality utilizing existing data sets. *Note: “Municipality” as defined in the County Charter includes the Oro Loma and the Castro Valley Sanitary Districts.

- Profile commercial/industrial/institutional recycling, construction and demolition debris programs, Environmentally Preferable Purchasing, and requirements for use of recycled content mulch and compost for landscapes in each of the municipalities, utilizing existing data sets.
• Compile and present existing metrics of (CalRecycle) diversion rates by jurisdiction, and StopWaste data on “percent good stuff in the garbage.”

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

• Research other states, regions and/or jurisdictions that have conducted landfill waste characterization studies comparable to those conducted for StopWaste in 1995, 2000 and 2008, and analyze results of overall percentages by weight of commonly recycled and composted materials remaining in the landfill stream and trends over time (i.e. percent good stuff in the garbage).

• 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.

Schedule and Selection Process:

It is proposed that the (RFP) be released in August or early September with a due date for proposals approximately seven weeks later. As with the last Five Year Program Review, a team of staff will evaluate and rank the proposals, and interviews by a panel of Agency and member agency staff will be held with the top two or three proposers, if necessary. Recommendation of contract award would be presented to the Recycling Board no later than the regular monthly meeting on December 8, 2016. It is expected that work would be completed in or around June 2017, with a final report presented to the Board soon after.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve the proposed schedule and scope of work for the Five Year Program Review.

Attachment A: Subsection 64.040: Recycling Policy Goals and Recycling Plan
Attachment B: Scope of Work from December 2011 RFP
Attachment C: Sample Annual Member Agency Data Sheet
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.
ATTACHMENT B

Scope of Work from December 2011 RFP

The objectives of this study are to:
1. Meet statutory requirements of Measure D;
2. Profile and compare municipal waste reduction efforts in Alameda County with each other and with comparable jurisdictions elsewhere, and to broadly evaluate countywide waste reduction program effectiveness.
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, “less than 10% good stuff in the garbage,” and other goals contained in the Strategic Workplan 2020:

V. SCOPE OF SERVICES
The consultant shall:
• Profile, compare and evaluate the residential recycling program parameters (e.g. materials collected, frequency, size and type of containers, residuals/contamination rates) and results (e.g. pounds per household, pounds per capita, cost per ton, % of residential discards diverted, etc.) in each Alameda County municipality* (including Fremont, Newark and Union City), distinguishing between singlefamily and multi-family service (where data is available), containers, papers and used motor oil versus plant debris/organics, and including graphical representations of comparative program results and analysis of possible reasons for differing results. Provide comparisons between local municipalities and jurisdictions with comparable demographics. *Note: “Municipality” as defined in the County Charter includes the Oro Loma and the Castro Valley Sanitary Districts.
• Profile, compare and evaluate the commercial/industrial/institutional recycling programs, services, policies, franchise provisions and ordinances in each of the municipalities. Evaluate publicly established refuse and/or recycling collection charges (i.e. rates) and their impact upon levels of commercial recycling and waste reduction activities in each of the 16 municipalities.
• Research and evaluate general levels and trends in private sector recycling, composting and waste prevention activity, and identify any perceived “gaps” or areas where municipal or county agencies might effectively increase levels of diversion through governmental action.
• Broadly evaluate the effectiveness and impacts of countywide waste reduction programs, focusing on the primary areas of discards management, product decisions, and communications.
• Research and report on feasibility and results of collecting “garbage” less often than weekly in areas where food waste and other organics are collected weekly for composting.
• Research other states, regions and jurisdictions that have conducted landfill waste characterization studies comparable to those conducted for StopWaste.Org in 1995, 2000 and 2008, and analyze results of overall percentages by weight of commonly recycled and composted materials remaining in the landfill stream and trends over time.
• For all of the above, develop recommendations for improvements and modifications indicated in current policies, procedures and practices for the Recycling Board, Alameda County, and the municipalities.
## Single Family Residential
(Defined as 1-4 Units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly Refuse Volume</th>
<th># Refuse Accounts</th>
<th># with recycling</th>
<th># with organics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30 Gallons/Mini-Can</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-32 Gallons</td>
<td>2740</td>
<td>2732</td>
<td>2736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64 Gallons</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-96 Gallons</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;96 Gallons</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Multifamily Residential Customers
(Defined as 5+ Units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly Refuse Volume</th>
<th># Refuse Accounts</th>
<th># with recycling</th>
<th># with organics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1 Cubic Yards</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3.9 Cubic Yards</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Cubic Yards</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## MF Accounts by Number of Units on Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th># Refuse Accounts</th>
<th># with recycling</th>
<th># with organics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-15 Units</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-60 Units</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-100 Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100+ Units</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Commercial Customers
(Defined as Non-Residential)

### Regular Weekly Refuse Volume

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refuse Volume</th>
<th># Refuse Accounts</th>
<th># with recycling</th>
<th># with organics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1 Cubic Yards</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3.9 Cubic Yards</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Cubic Yards</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### On Call Refuse Volume

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refuse Volume</th>
<th># Refuse Accounts</th>
<th># with recycling</th>
<th># with organics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3.9 Cubic Yards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Cubic Yards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Notes: