

STAFF REPORT

To: SBWMA Board Members
From: *Facility RFP Selection Committee* consisting of:
Larry Patterson, Chair, SBWMA
Mark Weiss, City of San Carlos
Jim Porter, County of San Mateo
Hilary Gans, Facility Operations Contract Manager
Kevin McCarthy, Executive Director
Date: July 24, 2008 Board Meeting
Subject: Approval of Facility Operations RFP Selection Committee
Recommendation to Shortlist South Bay Recycling and Hudson Baylor Corp.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board approve the Facility Operations RFP Selection Committee recommendation to shortlist **South Bay Recycling (SBR) and Hudson Baylor Corporation (HBC)** for negotiations to determine the selected facility operations contractor. After negotiations are completed with both firms, one firm will be recommended for approval by the SBWMA Board as the selected operator. Once the SBWMA selects the operator then final negotiations will commence regarding the Operations Agreement. These final negotiations will include the selection of a single stream processing equipment manufacturer or team of manufacturers. The final Operations Agreement will be subject to Board approval and approval by two-thirds of the Member Agencies.

Background

On November 1, 2007 the SBWMA released an RFP for the Operation of the Shoreway Recycling and Disposal Center (SRDC). By our March 4, 2008 deadline, the SBWMA received seven (7) responsive proposals from companies capable and qualified to operate the SRDC. The proposers were:

1. Allied Waste Services of San Mateo County (“**Allied**”).
2. Bayside Environmental Services & Transfer (“**BEST**” is a joint venture of Peninsula Sanitary Group, South San Francisco Scavenger Company, Green Waste Recovery and Zanker Road Resource Management).
3. Greenstar, LLC (“**Greenstar**”).
4. Hudson Baylor Corp with Waste Solutions Group (“**Hudson Baylor**”).
5. Norcal Waste Systems of San Mateo County (“**Norcal**”).
6. Republic Services, Inc. (“**Republic**”).
7. South Bay Recycling, LLC (“**South Bay**” is a joint venture of Community Recycling & Resource Recovery and Potential Industries).

An evaluation committee comprised of SBWMA staff Kevin McCarthy, Hilary Gans, and Marshall Moran along with Joe Sloan from Sloan/Vazquez evaluated each of the seven proposals and presented their findings to the Selection Committee. The Selection Committee meetings were held on May 13th, June 11th and June 25th.

The Evaluation Committee members evaluated the seven proposing companies using the evaluation criteria and weighting described in the RFP, Section 6 of the Facility Operations RFP and based scoring and final ranking on the following information from the following sources:

- Original proposals submitted on March 4, 2008
- Responses to technical and cost form questions sent out to proposers on April 1, 2008 and due back by April 7, 2008.

- 1-hour technical oral interviews held at the SBWMA offices on April 14-15, 2008
- Site visits conducted as follows:
 - April 18, 2008 at **Norcal Waste Systems** in San Francisco and South San Francisco Scavenger Company's Blue Line Transfer Station (part of **BEST**).
 - April 23, 2008 at Green Waste Recovery/Charles Street (part of **BEST**) and **Allied Waste's** Newby Island MRF and Composting Facility.
 - April 28, 2008 at Potential Industries and Community Recycling (**South Bay Recycling**) sites in Wilmington (near Long Beach) and Sun Valley, respectively.
 - April 29, 2009 at **Hudson Baylor** (three MRF sites in Phoenix).
- Additional site visits were conducted of MRF equipment installations in Seattle on April 30th at SP Recycling (CP Manufacturing equipment); and on May 2nd in San Diego at EDCO Disposal MRF operations in Lemon Grove (Van Dyk/Bollegraaf equipment) and Escondido (Machinex).
- Responses to technical interview follow-up questions sent out to proposers on April 25, 2008 and due back by May 12, 2008. These technical questions included providing each proposer an opportunity to make any changes to their cost forms.
- Other information submitted by proposers in response to requests by the evaluation team.
- Information gathered from reference checks, litigation review and other publicly available sources.
- The Selection Committee members, except for Hilary Gans, along with Joe Sloan also visited Potential Industries and Community Recycling (**South Bay Recycling**) sites in Wilmington (near Long Beach) and Sun Valley, respectively, on July 2nd. They also visited **Hudson Baylor** in Phoenix on July 3rd.

The Evaluation Procedures in the RFP (described in Section 6.1) envisioned a short-list being developed prior to technical interviews. After the initial review of proposals, the Evaluation Committee made the determination that all of the proposers met the minimum requirements. Thus, all seven firms participated in the technical interview and presentation process.

Analysis

The attached report provides the evaluation and scoring results for the seven firms that submitted proposals in response to the November 1, 2007 RFP for the Operation of the SRDC. The report details our evaluation of each firm's qualifications, technical proposal, cost proposal and other considerations. Pages 7-8 of the report provide a high level summary of the evaluation results. Major technical findings for each firm can be found in a series of tables on pages 10-16 of the report.

The Selection Committee believes **SBR** and **HBC** stand clearly apart from the other five firms for these reasons:

- The entirety of their responses (original proposals, written answers to technical questions, and technical interview performance) were the most thorough and complete.
- These companies offer a combination of experience, technical capability, and pricing that set them apart from the rest of the field. These two firms had the two lowest overall cost proposals.
- These two firms are the two most qualified single stream MRF operators and offer the best commodity marketing capabilities. This is critical given the growing importance of commodity revenues to fund SBWMA operations.
- Each of the two firms stand out financially with HBC offering the highest commodity revenue guarantee at \$10.1 million and SBR offering the lowest overall cost proposal.
- Each firm has a strong plan for increasing diversion at the transfer station and unique attributes to their proposed transfer station operations. HBC put together the most innovative

base proposal for transfer station diversion, while SBR offers the highest payloads and lowest cost transfer operation.

Proposers' evaluation scores are presented in **Table A**, Proposer Evaluation Score, which shows scores for each proposer on each of the criteria. Bolded scores reflect the best score within each criterion.

| TABLE A PROPOSER EVALUATION SCORE | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| <u>Item</u> | <u>Criteria</u> | <u>Max Score</u> | Allied | BEST | Greenstar | Hudson Baylor | Norcal | Republic | South Bay |
| 1 | Responsiveness to RFP | Pass/Fail | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 2 | Company's Qualifications & Experience | 100 | 81.5 | 88 | 73.5 | 85.8 | 84.5 | 74.5 | 84 |
| 3 | Cost Proposal | 100 | 81.8 | 70.4 | 64.9 | 79.1 | 72 | 62 | 86 |
| 4 | SRDC Operations Proposal | 100 | 67.8 | 80 | 64.5 | 87.3 | 75.5 | 63.8 | 86 |
| 5 | MRF Design, Installation & Start-up Proposal | 75 | 58.5 | 65.3 | 63 | 68.6 | 61.9 | 65.3 | 59.6 |
| 6 | Materials Marketing Plan | 75 | 62.6 | 60.8 | 42.8 | 66 | 60.8 | 55.9 | 74.3 |
| 7 | Environmental Enhancements & Other Considerations | 25 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 22.5 | 10 | 18.8 |
| 8 | Number & materiality of exceptions | 25 | 25 | 25 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 0 | 22.5 |
| Total Score | | 500 | 392 | 405 | 324 | 422 | 402 | 332 | 431 |
| Ranking | | -- | 5 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 1 |

Fiscal Impact

Based on the approved 2008 Allied Shoreway facility rate application and the approved FY 2009 SBWMA budget, the projected Allied compensation (i.e., costs plus profit) for 2008 is **\$15,597,056**; this excludes pass through expenses. The projected Allied 2008 compensation can be used as a baseline for comparison to the cost proposals from the seven firms to provide an estimated facility operations rate impact, exclusive of pass through costs (e.g., disposal costs, SBWMA budget, debt, etc.). As detailed in **Table B**, both South Bay Recycling and Hudson Baylor's proposed year 1 operational costs (shown in 2008 dollars and exclusive of capital costs for MRF sorting equipment to be purchased by the SBWMA) are below Allied's projected 2008 compensation.

Table B - Estimated Facility Operations Rate Impact (2008 dollars)

| Item | Allied Waste | BEST | Greenstar | Hudson Baylor | Norcal | Republic | South Bay |
|---|---------------------|--------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|
| A. Total Operating Costs (year 1) | \$15,695,193 | \$17,473,557 | \$16,050,891 | \$14,976,798 | \$17,286,734 | \$19,450,213 | \$11,422,201 |
| B. Annual Interest Expense (10-Year Average) | \$175,436 | \$230,425 | \$548,113 | \$239,588 | \$262,815 | \$325,574 | \$165,903 |
| Subtotal | \$15,870,629 | \$17,703,982 | \$16,599,003 | \$15,216,385 | \$17,549,549 | \$19,775,788 | \$11,588,104 |
| Percent Increase Over Allied 2008 Cost of \$15,597,056 | 1.75% | 13.5% | 6.4% | -2.4% | 12.5% | 28.5% | -26.8% |

Attachment: Selection Committee Report: Evaluation and Scoring of Proposals



RethinkWaste

South Bayside Waste Management Authority

SBWMA FACILITY OPERATIONS RFP

Selection Committee Report:

Evaluation and Scoring of Proposals

July 17, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| 1. | RECOMMENDATION | 3 |
| 2. | EVALUATION PROCESS | 4 |
| | 2.1. <i>Evaluation Criteria & Weights</i> | 5 |
| 3. | PROPOSAL EVALUATION RESULTS | 6 |
| | 3.1 <i>Proposer Scoring Results</i> | 6 |
| | 3.2 <i>Major Technical Findings</i> | 9 |
| | 3.3 <i>Cost Evaluation</i> | 17 |
| | 3.4 <i>Other Evaluation Areas</i> | 21 |
| | 3.4.1 <i>FINANCIAL CAPABILITIES</i> | 21 |
| | 3.4.2 <i>EXCEPTIONS</i> | 21 |
| | 3.4.3 <i>REFERENCES</i> | 22 |

TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| TABLE 1- EVALUATION CRITERIA AND MAXIMUM EVALUATION SCORE | 5 |
| TABLE 2- PROPOSER EVALUATION SCORE | 6 |
| TABLE 3- SOUTH BAY RECYCLING | 10 |
| TABLE 4- HUDSON BAYLOR | 11 |
| TABLE 5- BEST | 12 |
| TABLE 6- NORCAL WASTE SYSTEMS | 13 |
| TABLE 7- ALLIED WASTE | 14 |
| TABLE 8- REPUBLIC SERVICES | 15 |
| TABLE 9- GREENSTAR | 16 |
| TABLE 10- SCORING RESULTS FOR COST PROPOSALS | 17 |
| TABLE 11- COST SUMMARY | 19 |
| TABLE 12- SHOREWAY STAFFING LEVELS (FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS) | 20 |
| TABLE 13- CURRENT COMPANY VOLUMES AND REVENUE | 20 |
| TABLE 14- NUMBER OF EXCEPTIONS TAKEN BY PROPOSERS | 21 |
| TABLE 15- REFERENCE CHECKS – OVERALL OPINION | 22 |

APPENDIX A EVALUATION CRITERIA, SUB-CATEGORIES AND DESCRIPTION 23

| | |
|--|----|
| TABLE A-1 ITEM 2 – COMPANY’S QUALIFICATIONS & EXPERIENCE | 23 |
| TABLE A-2 ITEM 3 – COST PROPOSAL | 24 |
| TABLE A-3 ITEM 4 – SRDC OPERATIONS PROPOSAL | 24 |
| TABLE A-4 ITEM 5 – MRF EQUIPMENT INSTALLATION & START-UP PROPOSAL | 25 |
| TABLE A-5 ITEM 6 – MATERIALS MARKETING PLAN | 25 |
| TABLE A-6 ITEM 7 – ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENTS & OTHER CONSIDERATIONS | 25 |
| TABLE A-7 ITEM 8 – NUMBER AND MATERIALITY OF EXCEPTIONS | 26 |

APPENDIX B REFERENCES 27

APPENDIX C COMPREHENSIVE COST PROPOSAL SUMMARY 28

1. RECOMMENDATION

SBWMA received seven (7) responsive proposals from companies capable and qualified to operate the SRDC. The proposers are:

1. Allied Waste Services of San Mateo County (“**Allied**”).
2. Bayside Environmental Services & Transfer (“**BEST**”) is a joint venture of Peninsula Sanitary Group, South San Francisco Scavenger Company, Green Waste Recovery and Zanker Road Resource Management).
3. Greenstar, LLC (“**Greenstar**”).
4. Hudson Baylor Corp with Waste Solutions Group (“**Hudson Baylor**”).
5. Norcal Waste Systems of San Mateo County (“**Norcal**”).
6. Republic Services, Inc. (“**Republic**”).
7. South Bay Recycling, LLC (“**South Bay**” is a joint venture of Community Recycling & Resource Recovery and Potential Industries).

Based on our thorough review of the seven proposals submitted, technical interviews, site visits, follow-up questions and answers, and reference checks and litigation review, the Selection Committee recommends that **South Bay Recycling (SBR) and Hudson Baylor Corporation (HBC) be shortlisted** for negotiations to determine the selected facility operations contractor.

After negotiations, one firm will be recommended for approval by the SBWMA Board as the selected operator. Once the SBWMA selects the operator then final negotiations will commence regarding the Operations Agreement. The final Operations Agreement will be subject to Board approval and approval by two-thirds of the Member Agencies.

The Selection Committee believes **SBR** and **HBC** stand clearly apart from the other five firms for these reasons:

- The entirety of their responses (original proposals, written answers to technical questions, and technical interview performance) were the most thorough and complete.
- These companies offer a combination of experience, technical capability, and pricing that set them apart from the rest of the field. These two firms had the two lowest overall cost proposals.
- These two firms are the two most qualified single stream MRF operators and offer the best commodity marketing capabilities. This is critical given the growing importance of commodity revenues to fund SBWMA operations.
- Each of the two firms stand out financially with HBC offering the highest commodity revenue guarantee at \$10.1 million and SBR offering the lowest overall cost proposal.
- Each firm has a strong plan for increasing diversion at the transfer station and unique attributes to their proposed transfer station operations. HBC put together the most innovative base proposal for transfer station diversion, while SBR offers the highest payloads and lowest cost transfer operation.

2. EVALUATION PROCESS

Seven companies responded to the SBWMA's request for proposals (RFP) for Facility Operations issued on November 1, 2007. The Evaluation and Selection Committee members have evaluated the seven proposing companies and based scoring and final ranking on the following information from the following sources:

- Original proposals submitted on March 4, 2008
- Responses to technical and cost form questions sent out to proposers on April 1, 2008 and due back by April 7, 2008.
- 1-hour technical oral interviews held at the SBWMA offices on April 14-15, 2008
- Site visits conducted as follows:
 - April 18, 2008 at **Norcal Waste Systems** in San Francisco and South San Francisco Scavenger Company's Blue Line Transfer Station (part of **BEST**).
 - April 23, 2008 at Green Waste Waste/Charles Street (part of **BEST**) and **Allied Waste's** Newby Island MRF and Composting Facility.
 - April 28, 2008 at Potential Industries and Community Recycling (**South Bay Recycling**) sites in Wilmington (near Long Beach) and Sun Valley, respectively.
 - April 29, 2009 at **Hudson Baylor** (three MRF sites in Phoenix).
- Additional site visits were conducted of MRF equipment installations in Seattle on April 30th at SP Recycling (CP Manufacturing equipment); and on May 2nd in San Diego at EDCO Disposal MRF operations in Lemon Grove (Bollegraaf equipment) and Escondido (Machinex).
- Responses to technical interview follow-up questions sent out to proposers on April 25, 2008 and due back by May 12, 2008. These technical questions included providing each proposer an opportunity to make any changes to their cost forms.
- Other information submitted by proposers in response to requests by the evaluation team.
- Information gathered from reference checks and other publicly available sources.

The Evaluation Committee members numerically scored proposing companies using the evaluation criteria and weighting described in the RFP, Section 6 of the Facility Operations RFP. **Appendix A** includes tables detailing the weighting of the subcategories within each of the evaluation criteria. The scores assigned to each of the proposals' criteria reflect the extent to which the company fulfills the requirements of the evaluation criteria and meets the needs of the SBWMA relative to the other proposers.

The Evaluation Committee, consisting of SBWMA Staff members Kevin McCarthy, Marshall Moran, and Hilary Gans, and consultant Joe Sloan from Sloan/Vazquez, went through an iterative process to evaluate the seven proposers. Each evaluator reviewed each of the proposals and cost information using a set of established criteria.

As shown in Table 6-1 of the RFP document and below in **Table 1**, a maximum evaluation score was assigned to each evaluation criteria with at total possible score of 500 points.

| Table 1- EVALUATION CRITERIA AND MAXIMUM EVALUATION SCORE | | |
|--|--|--|
| <u>Item</u> | <u>Evaluation Criteria</u> | <u>Maximum Evaluation Score</u> |
| 1 | Responsiveness to RFP | Pass/Fail |
| 2 | Company's Qualifications & Experience | 100 |
| 3 | Cost Proposal | 100 |
| 4 | SRDC Operations Proposal | 100 |
| 5 | MRF Installation and Startup Proposal (MRF Equipment Design, Installation & Start-up Plan) | 75 |
| 6 | Materials Marketing Plan | 75 |
| 7 | Environmental Enhancements & Other Considerations | 25 |
| 8 | Number & Materiality of Exceptions | 25 |
| | Total Maximum Score | 500 |

The ratings from the evaluators were compiled and discussed during several evaluation committee meetings to determine a preliminary ranking of the proposals based solely on the evaluation criteria. The relative rankings were adjusted as new information was analyzed throughout the evaluation process.

The Evaluation Committee's work was discussed with the Selection Committee at three separate meetings held on May 13th, June 11th, and June 25th. At the last meeting on June 25th, the Selection Committee unanimously approved the evaluation committee's recommendation to shortlist SBR and HBC.

The Evaluation Procedures in the RFP (described in Section 6.1) envisioned a short-list being developed prior to technical interviews. After the initial review of proposals, the Evaluation Committee made the determination that all of the proposers met the minimum requirements. Thus, all seven firms participated in the technical interview and presentation process.

2.1. Evaluation Criteria & Weights

Except for Item #1 - ***Responsiveness to RFP*** which was given a pass/fail, each criterion or item was broken down into sub-categories, as described in full in RFP Sections 6.2.1 through 6.2.8, to which a *Weight* (expressed as a percentage) was assigned to each one. The assignment of weights was established by the Evaluation Committee to reflect the relative importance of each sub-category to the overall evaluation criteria score. **Appendix A** details the evaluation criteria and sub-categories considered by the Evaluation Committee in scoring proposers in the evaluation process.

3. PROPOSAL EVALUATION RESULTS

3.1 Proposer Scoring Results

Proposers' evaluation scores are presented in **Table 2**, Proposer Evaluation Score, which shows scores for each proposer on each of the criteria. Circled scores represent the best scores.

| TABLE 2- PROPOSER EVALUATION SCORE | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Item | Criteria | Max Score | Allied | BEST | Green star | Hudson Baylor | Norcal | Republic | South Bay |
| 1 | Responsiveness to RFP | Pass/Fail | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 2 | Company's Qualifications & Experience | 100 | 81.5 | 88 | 73.5 | 85.8 | 84.5 | 74.5 | 84 |
| 3 | Cost Proposal | 100 | 81.8 | 70.4 | 64.9 | 79.1 | 72 | 62 | 86 |
| 4 | SRDC Operations Proposal | 100 | 67.8 | 80 | 64.5 | 87.3 | 75.5 | 63.8 | 86 |
| 5 | MRF Design, Installation & Start-up Proposal | 75 | 58.5 | 65.3 | 63 | 68.6 | 61.9 | 65.3 | 59.6 |
| 6 | Materials Marketing Plan | 75 | 62.6 | 60.8 | 42.8 | 66 | 60.8 | 55.9 | 74.3 |
| 7 | Environmental Enhancements & Other Considerations | 25 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 22.5 | 10 | 18.8 |
| 8 | Number & materiality of exceptions | 25 | 25 | 25 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 0 | 22.5 |
| Total Score | | 500 | 392 | 405 | 324 | 422 | 402 | 332 | 431 |
| Ranking | | -- | 5 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 1 |

The following is a summary highlighting the evaluation results for the seven firms. The two short-listed firms are presented first followed by the remaining firms in order of their ranking (see **Table 2**).

South Bay Recycling, Inc. (SBR)

1. SBR is an experienced MRF operator, operating the largest single-stream plant in California for over ten years. SBR's Wilmington plant (*Potential Industries*) processes about 17,000 tons per month (tpm) (the SRDC operation by contrast will process approximately 7,000 TPM). SBR is the contracted processor for single-stream materials for the City of Los Angeles, City of Long Beach, and other local communities.
2. SBR's transfer station operator (*Community Recycling*) operates one of the largest transfer operations in California processing over 5,000 tons per day (tpd) of mixed residential and commercial refuse, construction and demolition debris (C&D), and organic waste streams. They also operate a fleet of over sixty transfer trucks, more than twice the size of the current SRDC fleet.
3. Long-term proven ability to gain highest market prices for recovered commodities. Potential has direct ownership in Chinese newsprint and tissue mills, which helps ensure long-term access to end markets.
4. SBR's cost proposal is the lowest of all bidders (\$3.6M annually lower than HBC).
5. Good transfer station diversion plan – with option to install C&D sort line (at price not to exceed Zanker Road's processing fees currently charged the SBWMA) and/or a municipal solid waste (MSW) processing system in the transfer station.
6. Proposed MRF operating cost is quite low, but plausible given the experience of the proposer and their written confirmation of cost considerations. The transportation costs appear very low and could leave SBWMA exposed to pressure for future rate adjustments that exceed the provisions of the draft agreement.
7. Both Community Recycling and Potential Industries operate in a highly cost competitive, non-franchised business environment. This results in housekeeping standards and general facility appearance not at the same level as a municipally owned facility like the SRDC.
8. The proposed MRF processing system, manufactured by Oregon based Bulk Handling Systems (BHS), is well designed and has a comparability lower cost of \$13,730,447.

Hudson Baylor Corporation (HBC)

1. Experienced MRF operator with 10 facilities annually handling 174,000 tons of single stream recyclables, 154,000 tons of dual stream recyclables, and 129,000 tons of "bottle law" materials in 2008. Operate three single stream MRFs in Phoenix area.
2. Extraordinary base commodity sales revenue guarantee of \$10.1M (\$3.35M above SBWMA requirement). This is based on HBC having secured ten-year floor prices from their recovered material purchasers.
3. Overall pricing for services places HBC 2nd lowest after SBR (HBC's annual cost is approximately \$3.6M higher than SBR).
4. HBC's core business is operation of municipally-owned facilities so they have a keen cultural understanding of municipal customer service, reporting, and operating expectations and contract standards.

5. HBC's transfer station operator (Waste Solutions Group) does not have the breadth of experience comparable to some of the other proposers, though they did offer a well thought out and innovative Transfer Station diversion plan.
6. HBC's proposed MRF processing system, manufactured primarily by the Dutch company Bollegraaf is an excellent, efficient system but carries the highest price tag of all proposers at \$17,479,188.

Highlights of Other Proposers

- **Bayside Environmental Services & Transfer (BEST).** The management team is highly capable and the company's technical plans for operating the transfer station and transportation operations are strong. BEST was ranked first for "Company Qualifications & Experience". BEST would do an adequate job of running the MRF and an excellent job of managing the transfer/transport operations, yet their proposed operating costs to perform the required services are not competitive with the two top ranked companies.

BEST's option to purchase the Hatcher Press property, adjacent to SRDC, raises the company's future stature as a third party processor for the SBWMA. Supplementing the SRDC operational footprint with the Hatcher property creates tremendous potential to expand waste diversion programs that could greatly benefit the SBWMA, however, this benefit alone is not sufficient to shortlist them.

- **Norcal.** San Francisco based Norcal prepared an excellent proposal, thoroughly addressing each component of the RFP. Norcal took a thoughtful approach to most aspects of the SRDC operation (i.e., traffic management, transfer station, transportation, educational programs, and Buy-Back Center operations). Norcal was ranked first for "Environmental Enhancements & Other Considerations." The company's nearby SFR&D facility offers excellent back-up capacity for SBWMA, including trucks, trailers, and personnel.

Norcal, like BEST, drops from contention for short-listing by merit of their high proposed operating costs. Norcal also was ranked much lower relative to SBR and HBC in MRF operations.

- **Allied Waste.** Allied offered a good technical plan for the operation of the MRF and a 80/20 revenue split on all commodity sales revenue above the required minimum revenue guarantee of \$6.75M. The company's overall price proposal ranked third lowest.

Allied's transfer station proposal, however, nearly mirrors the current operations including the subpar transfer truck payloads. At each step in the proposal process, after the original review of written submittals, Allied has declined in the rankings. Notably they performed quite poorly in their technical interview.

- **Republic Services.** Republic Services has presented a very solid response to the RFP but they have proposed very high operating costs across-the-board, and taken 26 exceptions to the Draft Agreement.
- **Greenstar.** Greenstar is a young company that will likely be qualified to operate a facility of the SRDC magnitude by the time the new contract is implemented. At this point in time, however, the company does not have the experience to be competitive in the selection process; this was especially evident with the substandard proposal response. Additionally, Greenstar took 25 exceptions to the Draft Agreement.

3.2 Major Technical Findings

The tables that follow (**Tables 3-9**) provide brief descriptions of the major technical findings that came out of the Evaluation Committee meetings and discussion. These findings do not represent an all inclusive summary of the proposer's proposed services, but rather provide a highlight of what the Evaluation Committee found to be significant differentiators between proposers. The tables are in the order of each proposer's respective ranking (see **Table 2**).

**Table 3-
SOUTH BAY RECYCLING**

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- Community operates one of largest (5,000 tpd) MRF/Transfer Stations in the State.
- SBR operates 6 processing sites. Potential operates California's largest single-stream operation at 17,000 tpm, plus smaller satellite operations. Also, own and operate two biomass power plants and a large composting facility.
- Top level management is very experienced and dedicated to recycling and service innovation though it is unlikely that any of the current manager/owners will be involved in SRDC day-to-day operations. There is a significant responsibility-gap between executives and line managers.
- Facilities are highly efficient and managed to maximize profitability in a non-franchised business environment. This results in housekeeping standards and general facility appearance not at the same level as a municipally owned facility like the SRDC.
- The owners of Community Recycling and Potential have a long-term working relationship and thus no issues are expected in the management of the joint venture company, South Bay Recycling.

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

- SBR has projected highest average transfer station payload at 23.5 tons per load.
- Aggressive floor sorting of self-haul on the transfer station tip floor is proposed. C&D sort line installed at cost equal to or less than Zanker's sorting cost. Option to recover 10-15 percent of the MSW as "soiled biomass" to their Madera biomass power plant for diversion credit.
- Highest projected MRF productivity as measured by tons per labor (sorter) hour.
- WAM scale system with ability to aggregate data for individual reports and export to different format, such as Excel, for reports tailored to SBWMA's requirements.
- Provided excellent description of MRF plant functions and process flow. Equipment designed to minimize material handling and for redundancy to assure continuous operation.
- Long-term proven ability to gain highest market prices for recovered commodities. Company has direct ownership in Chinese newsprint and tissue mills, which helps ensure long-term access to end markets.
- Bulk Handling Systems (BHS) is SBR's primary MRF equipment vendor. BHS has made significant improvements in component design and function. All components are American made and all parts are locally available.
- Environmental enhancements: Option to purchase green electricity for Shoreway via affiliated entity, Madera Power, LLC; and use of B-20 biofuel in all rolling stock.

**Table 4-
HUDSON BAYLOR**

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- Experienced MRF operator with 10 facilities annually handling 174,000 tons of single stream recyclables, 154,000 tons of dual stream recyclables, and 129,000 tons of “bottle law” materials in 2008. Operate three single stream MRFs in Phoenix area.
- HBC’s corporate managers are strong and they have staffed and successfully operated remote operations. Staff has not been identified for SBWMA operation.
- HBC has most direct experience operating the type of single stream equipment and under comparable municipal arrangements to SBWMA. High confidence in their overall management ability to run the SRDC compliant with contractual requirements.
- HBC’s transfer station operator (Waste Solutions Group) does not have the breadth of experience comparable to some of the other proposers, though WSG’s strength is in transportation logistics.

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

- HBC/WSG presented an excellent transfer station operation plan to maximize diversion and improve operational efficiencies. Diversion is almost exclusively accomplished w/ small loaders and other equipment.
- MRF proposal demonstrates high degree of experience in material processing, good mixture of labor and technology to accomplish SBWMA requirements.
- Proposed transfer station average payload of 21.5 tons, about 10% above the current average.
- Creative Information Systems (CIS) scale software integrates truck scales, pit scales, pallet scales into single comprehensive system for generation requested SBWMA reports.
- Assurances of smooth transition based upon three (3) new plants openings and three (3) plant takeovers during past eight (8) years.
- Proposes dual-line residential single-stream system. Provides maximum use of technology; screens, optical units, eddy currents, air, etc. Proposed largest number of optical sorters to clean-up fiber (paper) & container (bottles and cans) streams and recover plastics.
- Centralized commodity marketing with long-term end market relationships. For this contract, HBC has secured ten-year floor prices from their recovered material purchasers.
- Environmental enhancements - Use of B-20 biofuel in all rolling stock.

**Table 5-
BEST**

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- BEST group operates eight Bay Area MRF and/or transfer station operations including Mission Trails (San Jose), ACI (Alameda), South SF Scavenger (SSF), Sunnyvale Smart Station, and Green Waste Recovery and Zanker Road facilities in (San Jose).
- Processing operations range the full spectrum from single stream MRFs to C&D processing to composting operations. Green Waste Recovery/Zanker Road is widely regarded as a leading innovator in materials processing.
- One of three proposing companies to designate its management team for facility operations. Steve Jones as GM is very strong. Michael Gross and Brian Jones have excellent experience.

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

- Transfer Station operating plan indicates experience and thorough consideration of important factors including; materials targeted for floor sorting, traffic flow, and safety, and payload maximization. Good use of scale house, spotters and floor sorters for management of self-haulers from scale to off-load area and facility exit.
- Excellent payload projection. Proposal emphasizes the compaction of material on transfer station tip floor to get maximum payloads. Truck count reflects higher payload at 23 tons.
- Additional transfer station targeted materials include; gypsum wallboard; tires; e-waste; auto/truck batteries; motor oil; filters; and antifreeze.
- MRF equipment proposal proposes dual-line (2-practically identical SS lines) for redundancy and excess capacity. Excellent description of design intent and material flow.
- Low projected MRF productivity as measured by tons per labor (sorter) hour, particularly considering the amount of screening, optical, and eddy current technology that is proposed.
- CP Manufacturing is a highly respected manufacturer of Single Stream MRF systems. Company has many installations comparable to those required by SBWMA.
- No centralized commodity marketing. Currently markets relatively small volumes. Limited staff and experience.
- Environmental enhancements: Use of re-refined oil; recycled paper; develop energy conservation plan; and commitment to provide excellent educational program, tours, and activities.

Table 6- NORCAL WASTE SYSTEMS

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- Norcal operates several MRF/transfer station facilities including Recycle Central MRF, San Francisco iMRF, San Francisco Transfer Station, Yuba-Sutter Disposal Inc. MRF and Transfer Station and Vallejo Garbage Services, Inc. MRF.
- The SFR&D is a large nearby facility that provides services comparable to those required by SBWMA. Norcal's management group has substantial local experience.
- Norcal's only large scale single-stream processing experience is at the Pier 96 MRF in San Francisco. Pier 96, though it has experienced design and mechanical problems and requires significant staffing levels, is able to produce marketable products from SF's collected recyclable materials.

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

- Norcal has proposed to maximize the diversion of self-haul and transfer station materials through the use of floor sorting with manual labor and small loaders. Norcal's projection of additional diversion from the transfer station and self-haul area is dependent upon their proposed use of thirteen (13) floor sorters, eight (8) spotters, and five (5) equipment operators. Norcal's proposed transfer station staff is the largest of all proposers.
- Projects recovery of added 32,000 tons per year – 25,000 at the C&D sort-line, 3,500 with better bunker program, and 3,500 through other means. The probable added recovery from Norcal's diversion proposal is about 3,500 tons per year and not the 32,000 tons as described.
- Proposed scale house management protocol will expedite the flow of traffic through the transfer station and increase the efficiency of the entire site.
- Norcal presented the most detailed and thorough of all submitted implementation plans with implementation milestones and schedule.
- Norcal projects a modest improvement in the average outbound payload of 21.5 tons.
- MRF equipment layout and description of the process flow is good. Designed with redundancy and attention to residue and refuse management.
- Norcal's sorter productivity is significantly below average compared to the other proposers.
- Machinex's major local installation (San Jose) has experienced many operational failures. Equipment installed at Escondido plant is major improvement.
- Good materials marketing experience in the Bay Area provided by local management.
- Environmental enhancements: Use of B-20 Biofuels in rolling stock; development of a high-end education program, tours and educational activities as in San Francisco; hybrid pick-up truck; self haul diversion program promotion; and proposal to develop anaerobic digestion options for SBWMA food scraps.

**Table 7-
ALLIED WASTE**

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- Allied runs the current operation and has the most experience with the SBWMA and SRDC operations. They know the site, union and workers, vendors, and truck routes. Current MRF operations are dual-stream which renders some level of processing experience, but is not comparable.
- Newby Island, San Jose, is Allied's local single-stream facility. Newby managers have helped with proposal preparation but have no apparent role in proposed facility operation.
- One of three proposing companies to designate its management team for proposed operations. Management team considered average compared to the other six proposing firms.

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

- Allied has proposed to "expand recovery" in the transfer station. However, the proposed scale house and load inspection operations are consistent with current operations.
- Company noted that they'll have more room in the TS self-haul area to work, yet there is neither a significant change in recovery tactics nor an increase in diversion.
- The company proposes the use of twenty-three (23) transfer trucks carrying average payloads of 19.5 tons per load. Depending upon truck/trailer weight, the legal payload capacity is 24-25 tons per load. Therefore, Allied's proposal offers no improvement over their current average payload.
- Allied's sorter productivity is slightly below average compared to the other proposers.
- Shoreway implementation plan is not specifically discussed in the proposal. The implication is that they have past operating experience to implement a transition plan.
- Good MRF equipment design to meet productivity and quality specs as well as trash/residue and glass handling.
- Allied selected Bulk Handling Systems (BHS) and offered a thorough rationale for their choice of equipment. BHS is "up and comer" with several major MRF installations currently underway.
- Allied is a large company with dedicated and centralized commodity marketing department. Allied has direct experience marketing SBWMA materials.
- Environmental enhancements: Purchase of green building products where applicable; potential purchase of carbon offset credits; use of B-20 Biofuels in all rolling stock; and continue to provide tours and community education.

Table 8- REPUBLIC SERVICES

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- Republic is the third largest waste management contractor in North America.
- Republic has local experience at the West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority MRF (the "IRRF") and the company operates smaller volume transfer station (Golden Bear) at former Richmond landfill site. IRRF processes about one-half of SBWMA capacity. Major experience is in Southern California, but not factored in proposal.
- Bay Area JPA experience (West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority).
- Peter Nuti is designated as primary manager for transition, installation, and start-up of new operation. He has many years of MRF management and Bay Area experience.

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

- Projects modest improvement over SRDC's current operations with emphasis on efficiency and safety. Good operations plan with average productivity projections.
- Transfer station diversions plan focuses on segregation of loads by using K-rail dividers placed about the tipping floor. Success depends upon getting trucks into position to deposit material into correct piles. Although K-rails are moveable, it seems that the described floor sorting procedure would be cumbersome and consume too much needed square footage on the tipping floor.
- Republic projects an average outbound payload of 20.3 tons, a slight improvement over the 19.5 ton average that is now produced by Allied.
- Extensive description of scale / traffic management procedure and data capture and management. PC Scale System/RSI interface.
- Republic's sorter productivity is significantly below average compared to the other proposers.
- MRF dual-line single-stream system is a solid design. Excellent selection of screens, optical sorters, eddys, and other apparatus to achieve SBWMA's production and quality standards.
- Very complete plan included in CP Manufacturing equipment description section. Schedules and procedures are detailed.
- No centralized marketing. Extensive use of brokers. No floor price guarantees.
- Environmental enhancements: General effort to conserve; use of alternative fuels in rolling stock and electric forklifts; and development of a high-end education program, tours and educational activities.

Table 9- GREENSTAR

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- Greenstar is an exceptionally experienced MRF operator currently operating 15 MRF's comprised of dual and single stream technologies. Greenstar operates materials recovery facilities in Wicklow, Sligo, Cork and Dublin, Ireland.
- Greenstar's executive management group has some of the best talent in the industry. They are currently an acquisition driven company with deep financial resources.
- No direct transfer station operations experience. During the technical interview, Greenstar stated they will commence TS operations in New Jersey this summer.
- Site manager(s) for SRDC operations are not identified in proposal. Rob Espinosa will act as "point-man" on project until right person is hired as site manager.

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

- Greenstar's transfer station operating plan is basically a description of the current materials management program in the facility. They propose to improve the transfer station management, self haul diversion, and floor recovery but do not present any firm explanations of how the company will achieve the higher diversion. Transfer station operating plan lacks detail and description of how diversion will be achieved.
- Submitted alternative plan for transfer station sorting using highly mechanized system to increase transfer station diversion. Equipment layout takes up much of the transfer station tip area.
- The company's projected average payload is slightly lower than Allied's current average.
- Proposal provides clear presentation of approach to single-stream processing. Excellent rationale for screen technology and use of optics.
- Greenstar's sorter productivity is significantly above average compared to the other proposers.
- MRF system shows exceptional functionality. Capable of meeting, and exceeding, all SBWMA production and quality standards. Excellent redundancy w/ attention to residue/trash removal.
- Bollegraaf and Ti-Tech are MRF system manufacturers of proposed equipment. Both are highly regarded.
- Greenstar management has demonstrated success in maximizing commodity sales revenues. Market large volumes, but no current California experience.
- Environmental enhancements: Use of B-20 Biofuels in all rolling stock; proposal to use green energy at facility at SBWMA expense;\$10,000/year donation to SBWMA for public education; and paid year around internship funded by company.

3.3 Cost Evaluation

Proposer's were asked to provide detailed pricing information by completing cost forms provided to them in RFP Attachments (RFP Attachment 3 contains the Facility Operations Cost Proposal Forms and Attachment 4 contains the MRF Equipment and Installation Cost Forms). The cost information provided by each proposer was entered by the SBWMA and consultants into a Comprehensive Cost Proposal Summary (see **Appendix C**). The summary was used to readily compare the seven proposers' costs to evaluate their "competiveness." The firms' cost competitiveness relative to each other was determined using a formulaic approach.

The information contained in the Comprehensive Cost Proposal Summary has been further summarized in **Table 11** Cost Summary, presented below in Section 3.3.2. **Tables 12** and **13** below provide important comparisons on each firm's overall staffing levels and commodity marketing metrics.

3.3.1 Reasonableness, Testing & Findings

In addition to evaluating cost competitiveness, the Evaluation Committee members also considered the reasonableness of the costs presented. In determining the reasonableness of companies' proposed costs, equipment selection, labor, and operating assumptions were considered against industry standards and the conditions at the Shoreway Recycling and Disposal Center. During the proposal analysis, there were numerous rounds of questions and costs form revisions conducted between the SBWMA and the proposers. The goal of this process was to obtain complete and accurate information that could be compared between proposers. At the conclusion of the cost proposal analysis, the SBWMA was able to standardize the technical and cost proposal information submitted by the seven firms.

3.3.2 Cost Analysis

The following Tables and summaries highlight the Cost Proposal evaluation results by proposer (also previously shown in Table 2). **Table 10** below shows the evaluation scores for the Cost Proposals only.

| TABLE 10- Scoring Results for Cost Proposals | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-----------|--------|------|------------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------|
| Item | Criteria | Max Score | Allied | BEST | Green Star | Hudson Baylor | Norcal | Republic | South Bay |
| | Cost Proposal | 100 | 81.8 | 70.4 | 64.9 | 79.1 | 72 | 62 | 86 |
| Rank | | | 2 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 1 |

South Bay was ranked highest by virtue of the lowest overall cost proposal at \$11.6 million. South Bay's scoring was reduced somewhat on "reasonableness" due to the evaluation committee concerns regarding their extremely low transportation costs and management/administration staffing levels.

Allied Waste was ranked second due to its low overall cost, third lowest overall at \$15.9 million, and lowest total capital cost for the MRF equipment and installation at \$15.2 million.

Hudson Baylor was ranked third due to its low overall cost, second lowest overall at \$15.2 million, and the highest commodity revenue guarantee at \$10.1 million. Their scoring was reduced somewhat on “reasonableness” due to proposing the highest capital cost for MRF equipment and installation at \$19.8 million.

Norcal and Best were ranked fourth and fifth, respectively, due to their high overall costs. Both companies’ proposed high staffing levels; Best had the highest costs for the transfer station operations, and Norcal had the second highest MRF costs. These firms’ overall costs are \$6 million and \$6.1 million, respectively, higher than South Bay.

Greenstar had the fourth lowest overall cost at \$16.6 million, but was scored even lower due to the “reasonableness” evaluation of their transfer station and transport costs.

Republic was ranked lowest on cost because by far they had the highest overall cost at \$19.8 million. Their proposed costs simply weren’t competitive and in several cases, for MRF costs and transport costs, their costs were unreasonable.

**TABLE 11-
Cost Summary (2008 dollars)**

| Annual Operational Costs & Interest | Allied | BEST | Greenstar | Hudson Baylor | Norcal | Republic | South Bay | Average |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Total SRDC Operating Costs | 15,695,193 | 17,473,557 | 16,050,891 | 14,976,798 | 17,286,734 | 19,450,213 | 11,422,201 | 16,050,798 |
| Annual Interest Expense (10-Year Average) | 175,436 | 230,425 | 548,113 | 239,588 | 262,815 | 325,574 | 165,903 | 278,265 |
| Annual Costs to SBWMA ¹ | 15,870,629 | 17,703,982 | 16,599,003 | 15,216,385 | 17,549,549 | 19,775,788 | 11,588,104 | 16,329,063 |
| Operating Capital | | | | | | | | |
| Facility Equipment Costs (Rolling Stock) ² | 6,431,247 | 7,077,953 | 7,371,105 | 6,389,000 | 6,302,576 | 5,919,533 | 5,614,381 | 6,443,685 |
| MRF Equipment (Paid by SBWMA) | | | | | | | | |
| MRF Processing Equipment | 12,356,441 | 13,993,039 | 15,019,205 | 17,479,188 | 13,070,223 | 13,332,638 | 13,730,447 | 14,140,169 |
| Installation & Start-Up | 2,808,920 | 4,693,800 | 3,595,000 | 2,325,000 | 4,008,780 | 3,570,000 | 3,412,802 | 3,487,757 |
| Total Equipment & Installation Costs ³ | 15,165,361 | 18,686,839 | 18,614,205 | 19,804,188 | 17,079,003 | 16,902,638 | 17,143,249 | 17,627,926 |
| Commodity Revenue | | | | | | | | |
| Commodity Revenue Guarantee ⁴ | 6,750,000 | 8,500,000 | 6,750,000 | 10,100,000 | 8,000,000 | 6,750,000 | 7,250,000 | 7,728,571 |
| Commodity Revenue Share – (Above Guarantee) | 80/20 | 75/25 | 75/25 | 75/25 | 75/25 | 75/25 | 75/25 | |

¹ Total annual payment to Contractor by SBWMA. The SRDC operating costs shown exclude MRF residue and buyback payment costs shown on Cost Form 3-I.

² Rolling-stock and other equipment purchased by the Contractor.

³ One-time capital costs paid by SBWMA.

⁴³ Minimum revenue payment from Contractor to SBWMA.

Table 12 summarizes proposed staffing levels for the Shoreway operations. South Bay had the lowest overall staffing levels and Republic the highest.

| TABLE 12- Shoreway Staffing Levels (full-time equivalents) | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|--------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| <u>Staffing Areas</u> | Allied Waste | BEST | Greenstar | Hudson Baylor | Norcal | Republic | South Bay | Average |
| Transfer Station | 22.5 | 32.1 | 20.0 | 24.9 | 33.2 | 23.0 | 24.4 | 25.7 |
| MRF (includes Public Buyback and Drop off Center) | 44.8 | 52.9 | 40.3 | 40.9 | 61.6 | 63.5 | 36.3 | 48.6 |
| Transport | 33.2 | 28.3 | 29.2 | 28.9 | 27.5 | 39.0 | 25.1 | 30.2 |
| Management/Administration | 4.0 | 12.5 | 6.0 | 9.0 | 8.0 | 17.0 | 6.0 | 8.9 |
| Total Staffing | 104.5 | 125.8 | 95.5 | 103.7 | 130.3 | 142.5 | 91.8 | 113.4 |

The information below in **Table 13** pertains to the commodities produced from the MRF operations; these are the separated materials prepared for sale to an end market (e.g., a paper mill). South Bay has the highest average revenue per ton.

| TABLE 13- Current Company Volumes and Revenue* | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| | Allied | Best | Greenstar | Hudson Baylor | Norcal | Republic | South Bay |
| Total Annual Tons Sold | 77,575 | 19,776 | 144,614 | 35,868 | 38,502 | 56,408 | 242,030 |
| Avg. Revenue Per Ton** | \$197.19 | \$187.44 | \$169.59 | \$254.16 | \$186.10 | \$197.40 | \$261.55 |
| SBWMA – 2006 Composition*** | \$191.09 | \$174.19 | \$123.44 | \$203.34 | \$189.64 | \$164.98 | \$228.49 |

*Data represents proposers' stated commodity sales revenue and average sales revenue for November 2007-January 2008.

**Revenue associated with composition of tonnage sold by proposer, not SBWMA composition.

***Average revenue per ton adjusted for the composition of commodities sold from existing Shoreway operations.

3.4 Other Evaluation Areas

3.4.1 Financial Capabilities

Based on a preliminary review of the financial information provided by the proposers, it is believed all seven companies under consideration have adequate financial capabilities and can raise sufficient capital for the startup and ongoing operations of the Shoreway Recycling and Disposal Center. Allied Waste is the largest of the companies with annual revenue of ~\$6 billion - - by contrast the smaller companies, Hudson Baylor and South Bay have estimated annual incomes in the range of \$47M to \$140M. It should be noted that as a component of the signing of the Agreement for services, the selected contractor will need to provide bonding as a surety in case there is a default on the Agreement.

3.4.2 Exceptions

Only three firms of the seven took exceptions to the Agreement. In the case of Republic Services, the number and severity of the exceptions was so significant as to potentially remove them from consideration. Please see **Table 14** for a listing of the total number of exceptions taken.

| TABLE 14- Number of Exceptions Taken by Proposers | |
|--|---|
| <u>Proposing Firms</u> | <u>Number of Exceptions to the Agreement</u> |
| Allied Waste | 0 |
| BEST | 0 |
| Greenstar | 25 |
| Hudson Baylor | 0 |
| Norcal | 0 |
| Republic | 26 |
| South Bay | 1 |

3.4.3 References

Please see Appendix B for a complete summary of reference check information. The seven firms' reference check results for "Overall Opinion" are as follows:

| TABLE 15- Reference Checks – Overall Opinion | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| <u>Proposer</u> | <u>OVERALL OPINION</u> | | |
| | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Extremely Satisfactory |
| Allied Waste (7 references) | 0% | 66% | 34% |
| BEST (8 references) | 0% | 30% | 70% |
| Greenstar (8 references) | 0% | 75% | 25% |
| Hudson Baylor ¹ (5 references for HBC and 3 for WSG) | 0% | 51% | 49% |
| Norcal (4 references) | 0% | 65% | 35% |
| Republic (5 references) | 0% | 84% | 16% |
| South Bay ² (8 references for Community and 6 for Potential) | 1% | 56% | 43% |
| <p>¹ Separate references were provided for Hudson Baylor and Waste Solutions Group. The results above are a blended average. HBC's results were 36% satisfactory, 64% ext. satisfactory. WSG's results were 79% satisfactory, 21% ext. satisfactory.</p> <p>² Separate references were provided for Community Recycling and Potential Industries. The results above are a blended average. Community's results were 2% unsatisfactory, 74% percent satisfactory, 25% ext. satisfactory. Potential's results were 35% satisfactory, 65% ext. satisfactory. Community's unsatisfactory results were from a regulatory agency.</p> <p>Community Recycling received an unsatisfactory rating from the LEA (City of Los Angeles) that stemmed from a Cease and Desist order issued primarily regarding the company's outdoor C&D and wood grinding operations. These large operations had been in effect for many years when new regulations were adopted by the State. The company applied for the required permit and the application circulated in the City's Planning Department for almost four (4) years. Finally the CIWMB forced the issue, and the Planning Department was required to issue a Cease and Desist Order in accordance with City regulation. Community appealed to the Independent Hearing Panel and currently operates under an Interim Operating Agreement issued by the CIWMB as the permitting process moves forward.</p> | | | |

APPENDIX A

Evaluation Criteria, Sub-Categories and Description

Except for Item #1 - **Responsiveness to RFP** which was given a pass/fail, each criterion was broken down into sub-categories or factors, as described in full in RFP Sections 6.2.1 through 6.2.8, to which a *Weight* (expressed as a percentage) was assigned to each one. The assignment of weights was established by the evaluation committee to reflect the relative importance of each sub-category to the overall evaluation criteria score. **Tables A-1 to A-7** details the evaluation criteria and sub-categories considered by the Evaluation Committee in scoring proposers in the evaluation process.

| TABLE A-1 ITEM 2 – COMPANY’S QUALIFICATIONS & EXPERIENCE | | |
|---|---------------|--|
| <u>Sub-Categories</u> | <u>Weight</u> | <u>Description</u> |
| Company Experience, Transfer Station Experience (includes start-up and transition experience) | 20% | Demonstrated experience in start-up, transition & operation of transfer stations & transporting materials in comparably sized communities. If joint venture, proposer to demonstrate experience of parties working together. |
| Company Experience, MRF Processing Experience (includes start-up and transition experience) | 20% | Demonstrated experience in the start-up, transition & operation of MRF’s in comparably sized communities. If joint venture, proposer to demonstrate experience of parties working together. |
| Management (& Customer Service Systems) | 10% | Capabilities of existing management & responsiveness to the ongoing requests of customers. e.g., reporting, compliance, safety, billing, general quality. |
| Key Personnel Qualifications | 10% | Experience of key personnel for transition, start-up, and on-going management of SRDC operations. |
| Past Performance Record | 10% | Litigation history, regulatory compliance, and overall satisfaction of host jurisdiction & other municipal customers. |
| Financial Stability | 15% | Assessment of company’s financing plan, the ability to procure proposed equipment & review of financial statements. |
| Jurisdiction Satisfaction | 15% | Satisfaction of company’s references |
| Total | 100% | |

| TABLE A-2 ITEM 3 – COST PROPOSAL | | |
|--|----------------------|--|
| <u>Sub-Categories</u> | <u>Weight</u> | <u>Description</u> |
| Transfer Station Operations Cost Reasonable / Competitive | 10/10% | Logical relationship between proposed costs and operational assumptions. Cost competitiveness relative to other proposals. |
| MRF Operations Cost Reasonable / Competitive | 10/10% | Logical relationship between proposed costs and operational assumptions. Cost competitiveness relative to other proposals. |
| Transport Cost Reasonable / Competitive | 10/10% | Logical relationship between proposed costs and operational assumptions. Cost competitiveness relative to other proposals. |
| Equipment Installation & Start-up Cost Reasonable / Competitive | 7.5/7.5% | Logical relationship between proposed costs and operational assumptions. Cost competitiveness relative to other proposals. |
| Annual pass-through costs Reasonable / Competitive | 2.5/2.5% | Logical relationship between proposed costs and operational assumptions. Cost competitiveness relative to other proposals. |
| Revenue Guarantee Reasonable / Competitive | 10/10% | Logical relationship between proposed costs and operational assumptions. Cost competitiveness relative to other proposals. |
| Total | 100% | |

| TABLE A-3 ITEM 4 – SRDC OPERATIONS PROPOSAL | | |
|---|----------------------|---|
| <u>Sub-Categories</u> | <u>Weight</u> | <u>Description</u> |
| Transfer Station Operations (RFP Section 3.2, 3.4) | 20% | Reasonableness & reliability of proposed technology, equipment, and staffing level to achieve stated productivity. Rated by deviation from current operation & comparison to other proposals. |
| TS Diversion Plan (Diversion Ability and Plans, RFP Section 3.4)) | 20% | Proven reliability, and innovation of diversion programs and their waste diversion potential. Rated by deviation from current operation & comparison to other proposals. |
| MRF Operations (RFP Section 3.6) | 30% | Proven methods managing, tracking, and reporting operational activities, productivity, staffing, and training programs. Comparison of proposed operation to known standards including; headcount, production, hours of operation, etc. |
| Transportation Operations (RFP Section 3.5) | 15% | Proven methods managing, tracking, and reporting operational activities, productivity, staffing, and training programs. Comparison of proposed operation to known standards including; headcount, production, hours of operation, etc. Comparison of payload projections, # of trucks, drivers, etc |
| Scale System (RFP Section 3.3) | 5% | Capabilities, reliability, and connectivity of software system. Billing procedures and report generation. |
| Implementation Plan | 10% | Reasonableness of implementation plan & ability to meet deadlines. |
| Total | 100% | |

| TABLE A-4 | | |
|---|---------------|---|
| ITEM 5 – MRF EQUIPMENT INSTALLATION & START-UP PROPOSAL | | |
| <u>Sub-Categories</u> | <u>Weight</u> | <u>Description</u> |
| Single Stream Design (Equipment Selection / System Design / Layout) | 30% | Focus on operational areas (e.g., access, ingress / egress, safety, material flow, and handling efficiency, equipment manufacturer, consolidator, other components included in proposal) |
| Functionality, Capabilities & Separation Efficiency | 50% | Focus on throughput (tons/hour), effectiveness of material separation, and labor conservation. Proven effectiveness and ability to produce clean, high value commodities and minimal residual. Judged from know standards of productivity, technology, labor requirement, redundancy, energy consumption. |
| Installation & Start-Up | 5% | Reasonableness of installation plan and start-up schedule and ability to meet deadlines. (e.g. equipment manufacture and delivery schedule) |
| Past Experience | 15% | Demonstrated ability to manage the installation and start-up of the proposed equipment (including references & qualifications of subcontractors). Judged by known standards & manufacturer's maintenance requirements, and by comparison to other proposals. |
| Total | 100% | |

| TABLE A-5 | | |
|--|---------------|--|
| ITEM 6 – MATERIALS MARKETING PLAN | | |
| <u>Sub-Categories</u> | <u>Weight</u> | <u>Description</u> |
| Commodity Marketing Experience | 90% | Demonstrated ability to reliably market MRF commodities and obtain highest sales revenue, including: description of current and past results, the description of marketing organization, and specific personnel, volume, longevity, and proven price leader. |
| Other Materials Marketing | 10% | Creativity and experience marketing non-standard items, including: self-haul items, u-waste, e-waste, and other drop-off materials. |
| Total | 100% | |

| TABLE A-6 | | |
|---|---------------|--|
| ITEM 7 – ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENTS & OTHER CONSIDERATIONS | | |
| <u>Sub-Categories</u> | <u>Weight</u> | <u>Description</u> |
| Greenhouse Gas Reduction / Community Education / Other | 100% | Points awarded for proposed environmental enhancements that may include, but are not limited to greenhouse gas reduction & community educational programs. |
| Total | 100% | |

| TABLE A-7 ITEM 8 – NUMBER AND MATERIALITY OF EXCEPTIONS | | |
|--|----------------------|--|
| <u>Sub-Categories</u> | <u>Weight</u> | <u>Description</u> |
| Exceptions to Operating Agreement | 100% | Judged by the number and reasonableness of exceptions. |
| Total | 100% | |

APPENDIX B

References

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Company Experience and Qualifications (Jurisdiction Satisfaction) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------|-------------------|------------------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--------------|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Allied (7 references) | | | BEST (8 references) | | | Community (8 references) | | | Potential (6 references) | | | Greenstar (8 references) | | | HBC (5 references) | | | WSG (3 references) | | | Norcal (4 references) | | | Republic (5 references) | | | Totals (54 references) | | | | | | |
| Survey Question Groups | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Ext. Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Ext. Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Ext. Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Ext. Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Ext. Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Ext. Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Ext. Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Ext. Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Ext. Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Ext. Satisfactory | | | | |
| Diversión Programs | 0% | 72% | 28% | 0% | 44% | 56% | 0% | 86% | 14% | 0% | 27% | 73% | 0% | 85% | 15% | 0% | 42% | 58% | 0% | 92% | 8% | 0% | 68% | 32% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 57% | 32% | | | | |
| Facility Operations | 0% | 89% | 11% | 0% | 46% | 54% | 0% | 89% | 11% | 0% | 83% | 17% | 0% | 83% | 17% | 0% | 60% | 40% | 0% | 82% | 18% | 0% | 83% | 17% | 0% | 90% | 10% | 0% | 68% | 20% | | | | |
| Customer Service | 0% | 20% | 80% | 0% | 8% | 92% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 33% | 67% | 0% | 3% | 86% | | | | |
| Transitions | 0% | 68% | 32% | 0% | 11% | 89% | 4% | 96% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 30% | 70% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 67% | 21% | | | | |
| Overall Opinion | 0% | 17% | 83% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 13% | 75% | 13% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 1% | 32% | 55% | | | | |
| Totals | 0% | 66% | 34% | 0% | 30% | 70% | 2% | 74% | 25% | 0% | 35% | 65% | 0% | 75% | 25% | 0% | 36% | 64% | 0% | 79% | 21% | 0% | 65% | 35% | 0% | 84% | 16% | 0% | 59% | 41% | | | | |
| Combined Scores | | | | | | | 1% | 56% | 43% | | | | | | | 0% | 51% | 49% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Penalty Score (20% Deduction) | | | | | | | | | 34.4% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Proposer Reference Checks List

| Proposer | Agency/Company | Contact Name | Date Contacted | LEA | Contact Name |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|
| Allied Waste | Fremont | Kathy Cote | 6/4/08 * | | |
| | Merced County | Jerry Lawrie | 6/4/08 | | |
| | Milpitas | Kathleen Phalen | 6/4/08 | | |
| | San Carlos | Brian Mora | 6/4/08 | San Mateo Co, Dept of Env. Health | Brian Zamora |
| BEST | Alameda (ACI) | Maria DiMeglio | 6/9/08 | Alameda Co, Dept of Env. Health | |
| | Burbank Sanit Dist (GWR) | Donald Toy | 6/9/08 | | |
| | Millbrae (SSFSC) | Ronnald Popp | 6/9/08 | | |
| | Portola Valley (GWR) | Angela Howard | 6/9/08 | | |
| | San Leandro (ACI) | Mike Bakaldin | 6/12/08 | | |
| | SFO (SSFSC) | Art Lee | 6/9/08 | | |
| | So San Fran (SSFSC) | Barry Nagel | 6/10/08 | | |
| | Stanford Univ. (PSS) | Chonna Delaney | 6/10/08 | | |
| | Woodside (GWR) | Susan George | 6/9/08 * | | |
| Community Recycling | Glendale | Tom Brady | 5/22/08 | | |
| | Los Angeles | Stanton Lewis | 5/22/08 | City of LA, Env. Affairs Dept. | David Thompson |
| | Pasadena | Carmen Rubio | 6/5/08 | | |
| | Ralph's | Nick Verdugo | 5/28/08 | | |
| | Safeway | Gerald Jones | 5/27/08 | | |
| | Vons | Curt Smith | 5/27/08 | | |
| Greenstar | Des Moines | Bill Stowe | 5/28/08 | | |
| | Houston | Larry Stockham | 5/27/08 | | |
| | Iowa | Tim Ryburn | 5/28/08 | | |
| | Irving | Fran White | 5/29/08 | | |
| | MET - Tulsa | Michael Patton | 5/29/08 | | |
| | Norman | Steve Wornack | 5/27/08 | | |
| | Polk County | Bill Gartner | 5/27/08 | | |
| | San Antonio | Rose Zuniga-Dent Ryan | 5/27/08 | | |
| HBC | Gilbert | Louis Anderson | 6/2/08 | Not regulated | |
| | Mesa | Seth Weld | 6/2/08 | Not regulated | |
| | Phoenix | Carl Smith | 6/4/08 | Not regulated | |
| | Scottsdale | Sandy Nelson | 6/2/08 | Not regulated | |
| Norcal Waste | City of Marysville | Keith Martin | 6/4/08 | | |
| | City of San Francisco | Robert Haley | 6/4/08 | Dept. of Public Health | Henry Louie |
| Potential Ind. | Athens | Duane McDonald | 5/29/08 | | |
| | C R & R | Bob Williams | 5/29/08 | City of LA, Env. Affairs Dept. | David Thompson |
| | EDCO | Steve South | 5/29/08 | | |
| | Los Angeles | Miguel Zemenon | 5/29/08 | | |

SBWMA Proposer Reference Checks List

| Proposer | Agency/Company | Contact Name | Date Contacted | LEA | Contact Name |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------------------|--------------------|
| | Rainbow | Jerry Moffatt | 5/29/08 | | |
| Republic Services | Contra Costa Co CDD | Deidra Dingman | 6/5/08 | | |
| | Fairfield | Nancy Huston | 6/4/08 * | | |
| | Hecules | Nelson Oliva | 6/5/08 * | | |
| | Kensington | Greg Harman | 6/5/08 * | | |
| | Marin | Jonathan Logan | 6/5/08 * | | |
| | Marin County | Jeff Rawles | 6/5/08 * | | |
| | Piedmont | Geoffrey Grote | 6/5/08 * | | |
| | Pinole | Charles Long | 6/5/08 * | | |
| | Richmond | Bill Lindsay | 6/5/08 | | |
| | Rodeo Sanit. District | Steve Beale | 6/5/08 * | | |
| | San Pablo | Bradley Ward | 6/5/08 | | |
| | Solano County | Brigitta Corsello | 6/5/08 * | | |
| | Suisun | Suzanne Bragdon | 6/5/08 | | |
| | Travis AFB | Pamelia Fry | 6/5/08 * | | |
| West Contra Costa IWMA | Steve Devine | 6/9/08 | | | |
| WSG | Arcata | Steve Tyler | 5/28/08 | Humboldt Co - Dept of Health | Alexandra Wineland |
| | Eureka | David Tyson | 5/28/08 | | |

* left message - return call not yet received

SBWMA Reference Checks

| | Allied Waste | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|---|------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|---|---|------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|---|---|--------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | San Carlos (Shoreway) | | | Merced County (Newby Island) | | | Milpitas (Newby Island) | | | Fremont (Newby Island) | | | Contra Costa Co (CCT&R) | | | Carlsbad (Palomar) | | | San Mateo Co., Dept Env Health (Shoreway) | | | Total | | | | | |
| | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| I. Diversion Programs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A How would you rate the operator's diversion plan? | Unaware | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| B How would you rate the operator's self-haul waste diversion program? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | 1 | | Unaware | | | | 1 | | | | | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| C Is the operator meeting or exceeding diversion targets? | Unaware | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| D Has the operator added material to the diversion plan? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E How would you rate the operator's ability to market materials? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| F How would you rate the quality of the operator's diversion reports? | Unaware | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| G Has the operator introduced new programs to increase diversion? | Unaware | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| II. Facility Operations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A How would you rate the appearance/quality of the facility? | Unaware | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| B Have any liquidated damages been filed against the facility? | Unaware | | | N | | | Unaware | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C During peak times at the facility, what is the truck turn around time through the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | 10 - 15 min | | | 10 - 15 min | | | 5 - 10 min | | | 10 - 15 min | | | 10 - 15 min | | | | | | | | |
| D Has the facility had any complaints or issues with litter around the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | | |
| E Has the facility had any complaints or issues with odor around the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | | |
| F How would you rate the company's Housekeeping program? | Unaware | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| G Have there been any compliance issues with local, state, or federal regulations? | Unaware | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Allied Waste | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|---|---|------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|---|---|--------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | San Carlos (Shoreway) | Merced County (Newby Island) | | | Milpitas (Newby Island) | | | Fremont (Newby Island) | | | Contra Costa Co (CCT&R) | | | Carlsbad (Palomar) | | | San Mateo Co., Dept Env Health (Shoreway) | | | Total | | | | | | | |
| H How would you rate the efficiency of the equipment selected by the operator to achieve diversion goals, if applicable? | Unaware | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | 0 | 6 | 0 | | |
| I Does the Operator recommend new programs/equipment as they become available? | Unaware | Unaware | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| J How would you rate the operator's management of material through the Transfer Station and MRF? | Unaware | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | 0 | 6 | 0 | | |
| K How would you rate the operator's management of dumping areas of the Transfer Station and MRF? | Unaware | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | 5 | 1 | | |
| L How would you rate the operator's management of the Transfer Station and MRF? | Unaware | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | 3 | 3 | | |
| III. Outreach/Education | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U |
| A Do you feel that the operator has adequately performed outreach (school tours, etc.)? | Unaware | Unaware | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | |
| B What has the company's participation been with public outreach and tours of the facility? | Unaware | Unaware | | | Freq | | | Freq | | | Freq | | | Freq | | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | |
| C What has the company's participation been with community outreach events? | Unaware | Unaware | | | Freq | | | Freq | | | Freq | | | Freq | | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | |
| D Do you feel that the majority of community residents have an understanding of the public recycling options available, if applicable (self-haul diversion, buyback center, etc.)? | Unaware | Unaware | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Allied Waste | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---|----|----|--|
| | San Carlos (Shoreway) | Merced County (Newby Island) | Milpitas (Newby Island) | Fremont (Newby Island) | Contra Costa Co (CCT&R) | Carlsbad (Palomar) | San Mateo Co., Dept Env Health (Shoreway) | | | | | Total | | | | |
| E Does the Company promote the activities of the facility? | Unaware | Unaware | Very Active | Very Active | Very Active | Very Active | Unaware | | | | | | | | | |
| V. Customer Service | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | | | | |
| A How would you rate the operator's relationship with the City/County? | Unaware | Unaware | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | |
| B How would you rate the operator's responsiveness to requests made by the City/County? | Unaware | Unaware | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | |
| C How would you rate the operator's customer service department? | Unaware | Unaware | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | |
| VI. Transitions (if applicable) | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | | | | |
| A How would you rate the operator's efforts to implement their schedule of installing new equipment, etc.? | Unaware | Unaware | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | |
| B How would you rate the operator's design of the MRF, if applicable? | Unaware | Unaware | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | |
| C How would you rate the operator's response to complaints and problems regarding operation changes? | Unaware | Unaware | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | |
| D Overall, how would you rate the ease of operator's transition to new service? | Unaware | Unaware | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | |
| VII. Overall Opinion | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | U S E | | | | |
| A Overall, how would you rate the operating company and their services? | Unaware | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | 1 | 5 | |
| B Please list the pros and cons of doing business with the operator. | Unaware of MRF operation | Excellent operation | Extremely satisfied with quality of service | Good company to work with | Pleasure to do business with | Is a big help in recycling efforts | No violations to report; keeps facility orderly | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 67 | 34 | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | BEST | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---|---|----------------------|---|---|-----------------|---|---|---------------------------|------------|---------|-----------------|---|-------------|-------------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|----------------------------|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Alameda (ACI) | | | Portola Valley (GWR) | | | Milbrae (SSFSC) | | | So. San Francisco (SSFSC) | | | Stanford (PSSJ) | | | San Leandro (ACI) | | | SFO (SSFSC) | | | Burbank Sanit. Dist. (GWR) | | | Total | | | | | |
| I. Diversion Programs | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the operator's diversion plan? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | 3 | 5 | | | |
| B How would you rate the operator's self-haul waste diversion program? | | 1 | | Unaware | | | | | 1 | Unaware | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | 0 | 1 | 3 | | | |
| C Is the operator meeting or exceeding diversion targets? | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | | | |
| D Has the operator added material to the diversion plan? | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | |
| E How would you rate the operator's ability to market materials? | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | | | |
| F How would you rate the quality of the operator's diversion reports? | | | 1 | Unaware | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | Unaware | | | 0 | 2 | 4 | | | |
| G Has the operator introduced new programs to increase diversion? | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| II. Facility Operations | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the appearance/quality of the facility? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | | | |
| B Have any liquidated damages been filed against the facility? | | Y | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | |
| C During peak times at the facility, what is the truck turn around time through the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | 10 - 15 min | 5 - 10 min | Unaware | | | 10 - 15 min | 5 - 10 min | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D Has the facility had any complaints or issues with litter around the facility? | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | |
| E Has the facility had any complaints or issues with odor around the facility? | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | |
| F How would you rate the company's Housekeeping program? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | | | |
| G Have there been any compliance issues with local, state, or federal regulations? | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | BEST | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---|---|----------------------|---|---|------------------|---|---|---------------------------|---|---|-----------------|---|---|-------------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|----------------------------|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Alameda (ACI) | | | Portola Valley (GWR) | | | Millbrae (SSFSC) | | | So. San Francisco (SSFSC) | | | Stanford (PSSJ) | | | San Leandro (ACI) | | | SFO (SSFSC) | | | Burbank Sanit. Dist. (GWR) | | | Total | | | | | |
| H How would you rate the efficiency of the equipment selected by the operator to achieve diversion goals, if applicable? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | | | |
| I Does the Operator recommend new programs/equipment as they become available? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | |
| J How would you rate the operator's management of material through the Transfer Station and MRF? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | | | |
| K How would you rate the operator's management of dumping areas of the Transfer Station and MRF? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 7 | 1 | | | |
| L How would you rate the operator's management of the Transfer Station and MRF? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | | | |
| III. Outreach/Education | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U |
| A Do you feel that the operator has adequately performed outreach (school tours, etc.)? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | N/A | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | |
| B What has the company's participation been with public outreach and tours of the facility? | Freq | | | Freq | | | Freq | | | Cont Req | | | Freq | | | N/A | | | Cont Req | | | Freq | | | | | | | | |
| C What has the company's participation been with community outreach events? | Freq | | | Freq | | | Freq | | | Cont Req | | | Freq | | | N/A | | | Cont Req | | | Freq | | | | | | | | |
| D Do you feel that the majority of community residents have an understanding of the public recycling options available, if applicable (self-haul diversion, buyback center, etc.)? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | N/A | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | BEST | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|----------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|---|---|------------------|---|---|-----------------------|---|---|----------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|---|---|-------|---|---|----|-----|---|---|---|---|
| | Alameda (ACI) | | | Portola Valley (GWR) | | | Milbrae (SSFSC) | | | So. San Francisco (SSFSC) | | | Stanford (PSSJ) | | | San Leandro (ACI) | | | SFO (SSFSC) | | | Burbank Sanit. Dist. (GWR) | | | Total | | | | | | | | |
| E Does the Company promote the activities of the facility? | Very Active | | | Very Active | | | Very Active | | | Cont Req | | | Very Active | | | N/A | | | Cont Req | | | Very Active | | | | | | | | | | | |
| V. Customer Service | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the operator's relationship with the City/County? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | | | |
| B How would you rate the operator's responsiveness to requests made by the City/County? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | | | |
| C How would you rate the operator's customer service department? | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | | | |
| VI. Transitions (if applicable) | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the operator's efforts to implement their schedule of installing new equipment, etc.? | | | 1 | Unaware | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | | | |
| B How would you rate the operator's design of the MRF, if applicable? | | 1 | | Unaware | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | | | |
| C How would you rate the operator's response to complaints and problems regarding operation changes? | | | 1 | Unaware | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | | | |
| D Overall, how would you rate the ease of operator's transition to new service? | | | 1 | Unaware | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | | | |
| VII. Overall Opinion | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A Overall, how would you rate the operating company and their services? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | | | |
| B Please list the pros and cons of doing business with the operator. | Knows what "customer service" means | | | Great operation | | | Extremely satisfied with efforts | | | | | | Does a great job | | | No self-haul accepted | | | More than adequate service | | | Service provided is excellent | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 42 | 100 | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Community Recycling | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----------|---|---|--------------|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Los Angeles | | | Glendale | | | Vons | | | Safeway | | | Ralphs | | | City of LA, Dept. of Env. Affairs (LEA) | | | Pasadena | | | Santa Monica | | | Total | | | | | |
| I. Diversion Programs | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the operator's diversion plan? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | 7 | 1 | | | |
| B How would you rate the operator's self-haul waste diversion program? | | 1 | | | 1 | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | 1 | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | 0 | 3 | 0 | | | |
| C Is the operator meeting or exceeding diversion targets? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | Unaware | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 6 | 1 | | | |
| D Has the operator added material to the diversion plan? | Y | | | Y | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | Unaware | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | |
| E How would you rate the operator's ability to market materials? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | Unaware | | | | | 1 | Unaware | | | 0 | 5 | 1 | | | |
| F How would you rate the quality of the operator's diversion reports? | | 1 | | | | 1 | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 3 | 1 | | | |
| G Has the operator introduced new programs to increase diversion? | Y | | | Y | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Y | | | Y | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| II. Facility Operations | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the appearance/quality of the facility? | | | 1 | | | 1 | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | 2 | 3 | | | |
| B Have any liquidated damages been filed against the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | | | | | |
| C During peak times at the facility, what is the truck turn around time through the facility? | Unaware | | | 10 - 15 min | | | 10 - 15 min | | | 10 - 15 min | | | 10 - 15 min | | | 10 - 15 min | | | Unaware | | | 10 - 15 min | | | | | | | | |
| D Has the facility had any complaints or issues with litter around the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | N | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | | | | | |
| E Has the facility had any complaints or issues with odor around the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Y | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | | | | | |
| F How would you rate the company's Housekeeping program? | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 6 | 2 | | | |
| G Have there been any compliance issues with local, state, or federal regulations? | N | | | N | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Y | | | Unaware | | | Y | | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Community Recycling | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---|---|-----------|---|---|---------|---|---|---------|---|---|---------|---|---|---|---|---|----------|---|---|--------------|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | Los Angeles | | | Glendale | | | Vons | | | Safeway | | | Ralphs | | | City of LA, Dept. of Env. Affairs (LEA) | | | Pasadena | | | Santa Monica | | | Total | | |
| H How would you rate the efficiency of the equipment selected by the operator to achieve diversion goals, if applicable? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | Unaware | | 1 | | 0 | 7 | 0 | | |
| I Does the Operator recommend new programs/equipment as they become available? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | |
| J How would you rate the operator's management of material through the Transfer Station and MRF? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| K How would you rate the operator's management of dumping areas of the Transfer Station and MRF? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| L How would you rate the operator's management of the Transfer Station and MRF? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| III. Outreach/Education | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U |
| A Do you feel that the operator has adequately performed outreach (school tours, etc.)? | Y | | | Y | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Y | | | Unaware | | | | | |
| B What has the company's participation been with public outreach and tours of the facility? | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Freq | | | Unaware | | | | | |
| C What has the company's participation been with community outreach events? | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Freq | | | Unaware | | | | | |
| D Do you feel that the majority of community residents have an understanding of the public recycling options available, if applicable (self-haul diversion, buyback center, etc.)? | Y | | | Y | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Y | | | Unaware | | | | | |
| E Does the Company promote the activities of the facility? | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | | |
| V. Customer Service | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Community Recycling | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|---|---|--------------|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|--------------|---|----|-------|---|---|
| | Los Angeles | | | Glendale | | | Vons | | | Safeway | | | Ralphs | | | City of LA, Dept. of Env. Affairs (LEA) | | | Pasadena | | | Santa Monica | | | Total | | |
| A How would you rate the operator's relationship with the City/County? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | Unaware | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | | |
| B How would you rate the operator's responsiveness to requests made by the City/County? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | Unaware | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | | |
| C How would you rate the operator's customer service department? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | Unaware | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | | |
| VI. Transitions (if applicable) | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the operator's efforts to implement their schedule of installing new equipment, etc.? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| B How would you rate the operator's design of the MRF, if applicable? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| C How would you rate the operator's response to complaints and problems regarding operation changes? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| D Overall, how would you rate the ease of operator's transition to new service? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| VII. Overall Opinion | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A Overall, how would you rate the operating company and their services? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 |
| B Please list the pros and cons of doing business with the operator. | Good job diverting wastes | | | More than adequate diversion process | | | Good composting service | | | Provides service as expected | | | None to list | | | Cease & Desist order filed for C&D & Yard Waste operations | | | Impressive operation; pleasure to do business with | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 92 | 31 | | |
| NOTE: Cease & desist order filed by LEA - green waste operation was not permitted. Order was stayed pending acquisition of permit; no increase in green waste operation allowed until permitting completed. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Greenstar, LLC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|------------|---|---------|------------|---|------------|-------------|---|------|-------------|---|--------|------------|---|-------------|------------|---|-------------|-------------|---|--------|------------|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | San Antonio | | | Houston | | | Des Moines | | | Iowa | | | Norman | | | MET - Tulsa | | | Polk County | | | Irving | | | Total | | | | | |
| I. Diversion Programs | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the operator's diversion plan? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | | | |
| B How would you rate the operator's self-haul waste diversion program? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 8 | 0 | | | |
| C Is the operator meeting or exceeding diversion targets? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 8 | 0 | | | |
| D Has the operator added material to the diversion plan? | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | |
| E How would you rate the operator's ability to market materials? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 0 | 7 | 1 | | | |
| F How would you rate the quality of the operator's diversion reports? | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 7 | 1 | | | |
| G Has the operator introduced new programs to increase diversion? | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| II. Facility Operations | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the appearance/quality of the facility? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | | | |
| B Have any liquidated damages been filed against the facility? | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | |
| C During peak times at the facility, what is the truck turn around time through the facility? | | 5 - 10 min | | | 5 - 10 min | | | 10 - 15 min | | | 10 - 15 min | | | 5 - 10 min | | | 5 - 10 min | | | 10 - 15 min | | | 5 - 10 min | | | | | | | |
| D Has the facility had any complaints or issues with litter around the facility? | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | |
| E Has the facility had any complaints or issues with odor around the facility? | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | |
| F How would you rate the company's Housekeeping program? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | | | |
| G Have there been any compliance issues with local, state, or federal regulations? | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | N | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Greenstar, LLC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|---|---|-----------|---|---|------------|---|---|-----------|---|---|-----------|---|---|-------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|-----------|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | San Antonio | | | Houston | | | Des Moines | | | Iowa | | | Norman | | | MET - Tulsa | | | Polk County | | | Irving | | | Total | | | | | |
| H How would you rate the efficiency of the equipment selected by the operator to achieve diversion goals, if applicable? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| I Does the Operator recommend new programs/equipment as they become available? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | |
| J How would you rate the operator's management of material through the Transfer Station and MRF? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | 7 | 1 |
| K How would you rate the operator's management of dumping areas of the Transfer Station and MRF? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| L How would you rate the operator's management of the Transfer Station and MRF? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| III. Outreach/Education | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U |
| A Do you feel that the operator has adequately performed outreach (school tours, etc.)? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B What has the company's participation been with public outreach and tours of the facility? | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | | | | | | |
| C What has the company's participation been with community outreach events? | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | | | | | | |
| D Do you feel that the majority of community residents have an understanding of the public recycling options available, if applicable (self-haul diversion, buyback center, etc.)? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Greenstar, LLC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|---|---|--------------|---|---|----------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|--------------|---|---|-------|---|---|-----|----|---|---|---|---|
| | San Antonio | | | Houston | | | Des Moines | | | Iowa | | | Norman | | | MET - Tulsa | | | Polk County | | | Irving | | | Total | | | | | | | | |
| E Does the Company promote the activities of the facility? | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | | | | | | | | | |
| V. Customer Service | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the operator's relationship with the City/County? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | | | |
| B How would you rate the operator's responsiveness to requests made by the City/County? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | | | |
| C How would you rate the operator's customer service department? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | | | |
| VI. Transitions (if applicable) | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the operator's efforts to implement their schedule of installing new equipment, etc.? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| B How would you rate the operator's design of the MRF, if applicable? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| C How would you rate the operator's response to complaints and problems regarding operation changes? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| D Overall, how would you rate the ease of operator's transition to new service? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| VII. Overall Opinion | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A Overall, how would you rate the operating company and their services? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| B Please list the pros and cons of doing business with the operator. | None to list | | | Has an adequate diversion process | | | Performs as required by contract | | | Does a good job; no complaints | | | None to list | | | Performance is as expected | | | Performance is more than adequate | | | None to list | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 114 | 38 | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Hudson Bailer Corp. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|------------|---|---|------------|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Gilbert | | | Mesa | | | Scottsdale | | | Phoenix | | | Ridgefield | | | Total | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I. Diversion Programs | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | | | | | | |
| A How would you rate the operator's diversion plan? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 2 | | | |
| B How would you rate the operator's self-haul waste diversion program? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| C Is the operator meeting or exceeding diversion targets? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| D Has the operator added material to the diversion plan? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E How would you rate the operator's ability to market materials? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| F How would you rate the quality of the operator's diversion reports? | | 1 | | Unaware | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| G Has the operator introduced new programs to increase diversion? | Y | | | Unaware | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| II. Facility Operations | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | | | |
| A How would you rate the appearance/quality of the facility? | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| B Have any liquidated damages been filed against the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C During peak times at the facility, what is the truck turn around time through the facility? | 5 - 10 min | | | 10 - 15 min | | | 10 - 15 min | | | 5 - 10 min | | | 5 - 10 min | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D Has the facility had any complaints or issues with litter around the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Has the facility had any complaints or issues with odor around the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F How would you rate the company's Housekeeping program? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| G Have there been any compliance issues with local, state, or federal regulations? | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Hudson Bailer Corp. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---|---|-----------|---|---|------------|---|---|-----------|---|---|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Gilbert | | | Mesa | | | Scottsdale | | | Phoenix | | | Ridgefield | | | | | | | | | Total | | | | | | | | |
| H How would you rate the efficiency of the equipment selected by the operator to achieve diversion goals, if applicable? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 5 | | | |
| I Does the Operator recommend new programs/equipment as they become available? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| J How would you rate the operator's management of material through the Transfer Station and MRF? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | 0 | | | |
| K How would you rate the operator's management of dumping areas of the Transfer Station and MRF? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | 0 | | | |
| L How would you rate the operator's management of the Transfer Station and MRF? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 4 | | | |
| III. Outreach/Education | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U |
| A Do you feel that the operator has adequately performed outreach (school tours, etc.)? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B What has the company's participation been with public outreach and tours of the facility? | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C What has the company's participation been with community outreach events? | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Freq | | | Freq | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D Do you feel that the majority of community residents have an understanding of the public recycling options available, if applicable (self-haul diversion, buyback center, etc.)? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Hudson Bailer Corp. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|---|---|--------------------|---|---|--------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Gilbert | | | Mesa | | | Scottsdale | | | Phoenix | | | Ridgefield | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Does the Company promote the activities of the facility? | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Very Active | | | Very Active | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| V. Customer Service | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | | | | | | |
| A How would you rate the operator's relationship with the City/County? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | | | |
| B How would you rate the operator's responsiveness to requests made by the City/County? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | | | |
| C How would you rate the operator's customer service department? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | | | |
| VI. Transitions (if applicable) | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the operator's efforts to implement their schedule of installing new equipment, etc.? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 1 | 4 | | | |
| B How would you rate the operator's design of the MRF, if applicable? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 2 | 3 | | | |
| C How would you rate the operator's response to complaints and problems regarding operation changes? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 2 | 3 | | | |
| D Overall, how would you rate the ease of operator's transition to new service? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 1 | 4 | | | |
| VII. Overall Opinion | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A Overall, how would you rate the operating company and their services? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | | | |
| B Please list the pros and cons of doing business with the operator. | Excellent company to work with | | | A great company to work with | | | Excellent operator | | | Pleased with performance | | | Pleased with services provided | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 32 | 57 | | | | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Norcal Waste Systems | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|---|---|---------------|---|---|------------|---|---|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Marysville | | | San Francisco | | | Vallejo | | | Roseville | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | | | | | |
| I. Diversion Programs | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the operator's diversion plan? | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| B How would you rate the operator's self-haul waste diversion program? | | | 1 | | 1 | | Unaware | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| C Is the operator meeting or exceeding diversion targets? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| D Has the operator added material to the diversion plan? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E How would you rate the operator's ability to market materials? | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| F How would you rate the quality of the operator's diversion reports? | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| G Has the operator introduced new programs to increase diversion? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| II. Facility Operations | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the appearance/quality of the facility? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| B Have any liquidated damages been filed against the facility? | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C During peak times at the facility, what is the truck turn around time through the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | 5 - 10 min | | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D Has the facility had any complaints or issues with litter around the facility? | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Has the facility had any complaints or issues with odor around the facility? | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F How would you rate the company's Housekeeping program? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| G Have there been any compliance issues with local, state, or federal regulations? | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Norcal Waste Systems | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|---|---|---------------|---|---|-----------|---|---|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Marysville | | | San Francisco | | | Vallejo | | | Roseville | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | | | | | | | | |
| H How would you rate the efficiency of the equipment selected by the operator to achieve diversion goals, if applicable? | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 1 | | | |
| I Does the Operator recommend new programs/equipment as they become available? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| J How would you rate the operator's management of material through the Transfer Station and MRF? | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 1 | | | |
| K How would you rate the operator's management of dumping areas of the Transfer Station and MRF? | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 4 | 0 | | | |
| L How would you rate the operator's management of the Transfer Station and MRF? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 2 | | | |
| III. Outreach/Education | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U |
| A Do you feel that the operator has adequately performed outreach (school tours, etc.)? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B What has the company's participation been with public outreach and tours of the facility? | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C What has the company's participation been with community outreach events? | Freq | | | Freq | | | Freq | | | Freq | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D Do you feel that the majority of community residents have an understanding of the public recycling options available, if applicable (self-haul diversion, buyback center, etc.)? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Norcal Waste Systems | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|---|---|-------------------------|---|---|------------------|---|---|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Marysville | | | San Francisco | | | Vallejo | | | Roseville | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Does the Company promote the activities of the facility? | Very Active | | | Very Active | | | Very Active | | | Very Active | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| V. Customer Service | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | | | |
| A How would you rate the operator's relationship with the City/County? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 4 | | | |
| B How would you rate the operator's responsiveness to requests made by the City/County? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 4 | | | |
| C How would you rate the operator's customer service department? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 4 | | | |
| VI. Transitions (if applicable) | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the operator's efforts to implement their schedule of installing new equipment, etc.? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 4 | 0 | | | |
| B How would you rate the operator's design of the MRF, if applicable? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 4 | 0 | | | |
| C How would you rate the operator's response to complaints and problems regarding operation changes? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 4 | 0 | | | |
| D Overall, how would you rate the ease of operator's transition to new service? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 4 | 0 | | | |
| VII. Overall Opinion | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A Overall, how would you rate the operating company and their services? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 4 | | | |
| B Please list the pros and cons of doing business with the operator. | Efficient operation | | | Pleasure to do business | | | Does a great job | | | Happy with services provided | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 49 | 26 | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Potential Industries, Inc. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|---|------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | C R & R | | | Athens | | | Rainbow | | | EDCO | | | Los Angeles | | | Long Beach | | | Total | | | | | |
| I. Diversion Programs | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the operator's diversion plan? | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| B How would you rate the operator's self-haul waste diversion program? | Unaware | | | | 1 | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| C Is the operator meeting or exceeding diversion targets? | | 1 | | Unaware | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| D Has the operator added material to the diversion plan? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | |
| E How would you rate the operator's ability to market materials? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| F How would you rate the quality of the operator's diversion reports? | | 1 | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| G Has the operator introduced new programs to increase diversion? | N | | | Unaware | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| II. Facility Operations | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the appearance/quality of the facility? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| B Have any liquidated damages been filed against the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | | |
| C During peak times at the facility, what is the truck turn around time through the facility? | 10 - 15 min | | | 5 - 10 min | | | 10 - 15 min | | | 10 - 15 min | | | 10 - 15 min | | | 10 - 15 min | | | | | | | | |
| D Has the facility had any complaints or issues with litter around the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | N | | | | | | | | |
| E Has the facility had any complaints or issues with odor around the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | N | | | | | | | | |
| F How would you rate the company's Housekeeping program? | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| G Have there been any compliance issues with local, state, or federal regulations? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Potential Industries, Inc. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|---|---------|---|---|---------|---|---|---------|---|---|-------------|---|---|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | C R & R | | | Athens | | | Rainbow | | | EDCO | | | Los Angeles | | | Long Beach | | | | | | | | | Total | | | | | | | | |
| H How would you rate the efficiency of the equipment selected by the operator to achieve diversion goals, if applicable? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 3 | | | |
| I Does the Operator recommend new programs/equipment as they become available? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| J How would you rate the operator's management of material through the Transfer Station and MRF? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 4 | | | |
| K How would you rate the operator's management of dumping areas of the Transfer Station and MRF? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 0 | 6 | 0 | | | |
| L How would you rate the operator's management of the Transfer Station and MRF? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 6 | | | |
| III. Outreach/Education | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U |
| A Do you feel that the operator has adequately performed outreach (school tours, etc.)? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B What has the company's participation been with public outreach and tours of the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C What has the company's participation been with community outreach events? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D Do you feel that the majority of community residents have an understanding of the public recycling options available, if applicable (self-haul diversion, buyback center, etc.)? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Potential Industries, Inc. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|---|---|---------------------|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|
| | C R & R | | | Athens | | | Rainbow | | | EDCO | | | Los Angeles | | | Long Beach | | | Total | | | | | | | | |
| E Does the Company promote the activities of the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | |
| V. Customer Service | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | | | |
| A How would you rate the operator's relationship with the City/County? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 6 | |
| B How would you rate the operator's responsiveness to requests made by the City/County? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 6 | |
| C How would you rate the operator's customer service department? | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 5 | |
| VI. Transitions (if applicable) | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the operator's efforts to implement their schedule of installing new equipment, etc.? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 2 | |
| B How would you rate the operator's design of the MRF, if applicable? | Unaware | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 2 | |
| C How would you rate the operator's response to complaints and problems regarding operation changes? | | | 1 | Unaware | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 3 | |
| D Overall, how would you rate the ease of operator's transition to new service? | | | 1 | Unaware | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 3 | |
| VII. Overall Opinion | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A Overall, how would you rate the operating company and their services? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 6 | |
| B Please list the pros and cons of doing business with the operator. | Extremely efficient; pleasure to do business with. | | | Great company to work with; no complaints | | | Great materials vendor | | | Although a competitor, they do an excellent job | | | Pleasure to do business with | | | Top-of-line company | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 35 | 66 | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Republic Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|---|---|-----------|---|---|---------------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | W. Contra Costa IWMA | | | San Pablo | | | Contra Costa Co CDD | | | Suisun | | | Richmond | | | | | | | | | Total | | | | | |
| I. Diversion Programs | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the operator's diversion plan? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| B How would you rate the operator's self-haul waste diversion program? | | 1 | | | 1 | | Unaware | | | | 1 | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| C Is the operator meeting or exceeding diversion targets? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| D Has the operator added material to the diversion plan? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E How would you rate the operator's ability to market materials? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| F How would you rate the quality of the operator's diversion reports? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| G Has the operator introduced new programs to increase diversion? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| II. Facility Operations | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the appearance/quality of the facility? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| B Have any liquidated damages been filed against the facility? | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C During peak times at the facility, what is the truck turn around time through the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | 10 - 15 min | | | 10 - 15 min | | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D Has the facility had any complaints or issues with litter around the facility? | N | | | Unaware | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Has the facility had any complaints or issues with odor around the facility? | N | | | Unaware | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F How would you rate the company's Housekeeping program? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| G Have there been any compliance issues with local, state, or federal regulations? | N | | | Unaware | | | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Republic Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|---|---|-----------|---|---|---------------------|---|---|----------|---|---|----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | W. Contra Costa IWMA | | | San Pablo | | | Contra Costa Co CDD | | | Suisun | | | Richmond | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | | | | | |
| H How would you rate the efficiency of the equipment selected by the operator to achieve diversion goals, if applicable? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| I Does the Operator recommend new programs/equipment as they become available? | Y | | | Unaware | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| J How would you rate the operator's management of material through the Transfer Station and MRF? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| K How would you rate the operator's management of dumping areas of the Transfer Station and MRF? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| L How would you rate the operator's management of the Transfer Station and MRF? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| III. Outreach/Education | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U |
| A Do you feel that the operator has adequately performed outreach (school tours, etc.)? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B What has the company's participation been with public outreach and tours of the facility? | Cont Req | | | Cont Req | | | Cont Req | | | Cont Req | | | Cont Req | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C What has the company's participation been with community outreach events? | Cont Req | | | Cont Req | | | Cont Req | | | Cont Req | | | Cont Req | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D Do you feel that the majority of community residents have an understanding of the public recycling options available, if applicable (self-haul diversion, buyback center, etc.)? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Republic Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|---|---|--------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | W. Contra Costa IWMA | | | San Pablo | | | Contra Costa Co CDD | | | Suisun | | | Richmond | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Does the Company promote the activities of the facility? | Cont Req | | | Cont Req | | | Cont Req | | | Cont Req | | | Cont Req | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| V. Customer Service | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | | | |
| A How would you rate the operator's relationship with the City/County? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 4 | | | |
| B How would you rate the operator's responsiveness to requests made by the City/County? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 4 | | | |
| C How would you rate the operator's customer service department? | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 2 | | | |
| VI. Transitions (if applicable) | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the operator's efforts to implement their schedule of installing new equipment, etc.? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 0 | | | |
| B How would you rate the operator's design of the MRF, if applicable? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 0 | | | |
| C How would you rate the operator's response to complaints and problems regarding operation changes? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 0 | | | |
| D Overall, how would you rate the ease of operator's transition to new service? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 0 | | | |
| VII. Overall Opinion | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A Overall, how would you rate the operating company and their services? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| B Please list the pros and cons of doing business with the operator. | Gets the job done | | | They do what we ask of them | | | Does the job as expected | | | Service provided is adequate | | | Provides service as expected | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 68 | 13 | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Waste Solutions Group | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Arcata | | | Eureka | | | Humboldt Co Dept. of Health (LEA) | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | | | | | |
| I. Diversion Programs | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the operator's diversion plan? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| B How would you rate the operator's self-haul waste diversion program? | | 1 | | | 1 | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| C Is the operator meeting or exceeding diversion targets? | | 1 | | | 1 | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| D Has the operator added material to the diversion plan? | Y | | | Y | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E How would you rate the operator's ability to market materials? | | 1 | | | 1 | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| F How would you rate the quality of the operator's diversion reports? | | 1 | | | | 1 | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| G Has the operator introduced new programs to increase diversion? | Y | | | Y | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| II. Facility Operations | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the appearance/quality of the facility? | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| B Have any liquidated damages been filed against the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | N | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C During peak times at the facility, what is the truck turn around time through the facility? | 10 - 15 min | | | 10 - 15 min | | | 10 - 15 min | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D Has the facility had any complaints or issues with litter around the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | N | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Has the facility had any complaints or issues with odor around the facility? | Unaware | | | Unaware | | | N | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F How would you rate the company's Housekeeping program? | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| G Have there been any compliance issues with local, state, or federal regulations? | N | | | N | | | N | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Waste Solutions Group | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|---|---|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Arcata | | | Eureka | | | Humboldt Co Dept. of Health (LEA) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | | | | | |
| H How would you rate the efficiency of the equipment selected by the operator to achieve diversion goals, if applicable? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| I Does the Operator recommend new programs/equipment as they become available? | Y | | | Y | | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| J How would you rate the operator's management of material through the Transfer Station and MRF? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| K How would you rate the operator's management of dumping areas of the Transfer Station and MRF? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| L How would you rate the operator's management of the Transfer Station and MRF? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| III. Outreach/Education | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U | Y | N | U |
| A Do you feel that the operator has adequately performed outreach (school tours, etc.)? | Y | | | Y | | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B What has the company's participation been with public outreach and tours of the facility? | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C What has the company's participation been with community outreach events? | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D Do you feel that the majority of community residents have an understanding of the public recycling options available, if applicable (self-haul diversion, buyback center, etc.)? | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

SBWMA Reference Checks

| U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory E - Extremely Satisfactory Y = Yes N = No U = Unsure/Not Applicable | Waste Solutions Group | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Arcata | | | Eureka | | | Humboldt Co Dept. of Health (LEA) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Does the Company promote the activities of the facility? | Cont Reqs | | | Cont Reqs | | | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| V. Customer Service | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | | | |
| A How would you rate the operator's relationship with the City/County? | | | 1 | | | 1 | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 2 | | | |
| B How would you rate the operator's responsiveness to requests made by the City/County? | | | 1 | | | 1 | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 2 | | | |
| C How would you rate the operator's customer service department? | | | 1 | | | 1 | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 2 | | | |
| VI. Transitions (if applicable) | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A How would you rate the operator's efforts to implement their schedule of installing new equipment, etc.? | | 1 | | | 1 | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 0 | | | |
| B How would you rate the operator's design of the MRF, if applicable? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 0 | | | |
| C How would you rate the operator's response to complaints and problems regarding operation changes? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 0 | | | |
| D Overall, how would you rate the ease of operator's transition to new service? | | 1 | | | 1 | | Unaware | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 0 | | | |
| VII. Overall Opinion | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E | U | S | E |
| A Overall, how would you rate the operating company and their services? | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 0 | | | |
| B Please list the pros and cons of doing business with the operator. | No comments | | | Has an adequate diversion process | | | No complaints; responsive to suggestions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 38 | 10 | | | | | | | |

APPENDIX C
Comprehensive Cost Proposal Summary

Facility Operations Services
Proposer Cost Proposal Summary

| Table 1 Total Annual Costs (2008 dollars) | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|---------------------|--------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| Item | Reference | Allied Waste | BEST | Greenstar | Hudson Baylor | Norcal | Republic | South Bay | Average |
| A. Total Operating Costs (year 1) | Table 2. | \$15,695,193 | \$17,473,557 | \$16,050,891 | \$14,976,798 | \$17,286,734 | \$19,450,213 | \$11,422,201 | \$16,050,798 |
| B. Annual Interest Expense (10 Year Average) | Form 3 - K | \$175,436 | \$230,425 | \$548,113 | \$239,588 | \$262,815 | \$325,574 | \$165,903 | \$278,265 |
| Subtotal | | \$15,870,628 | \$17,703,982 | \$16,599,003 | \$15,216,385 | \$17,549,549 | \$19,775,788 | \$11,588,104 | \$16,329,063 |
| C. Recycling Revenue Guarantee | Form 3 - E | \$6,750,000 | \$8,500,000 | \$6,750,000 | \$10,100,000 | \$8,000,000 | \$6,750,000 | \$7,250,000 | \$7,728,571 |
| D. Buyback Customer Payments | Table 12 | \$1,200,000 | \$1,061,060 | \$0 | \$1,111,500 | \$1,031,216 | \$0 | \$1,026,000 | \$775,682 |

| Table 2 Operating Costs (2008 dollars) | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|---------------------|--------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Item | Reference | Allied Waste | BEST | Greenstar | Hudson Baylor | Norcal | Republic | South Bay | Average | |
| Transfer Station | Form 3-H | Total | \$3,581,237 | \$5,274,338 | \$5,227,647 | \$4,097,631 | \$4,525,808 | \$3,920,143 | \$3,152,139 | \$4,254,135 |
| | | per ton | \$8.60 | \$12.66 | \$12.55 | \$9.84 | \$10.87 | \$9.41 | \$7.57 | \$10.21 |
| MRF Processing, excl residual, buyback pmts | Form 3-I | Total | \$5,340,888 | \$5,908,811 | \$5,409,725 | \$5,535,896 | \$6,674,503 | \$7,739,570 | \$3,857,070 | \$5,780,923 |
| | | per ton | \$61.89 | \$68.47 | \$62.69 | \$64.15 | \$77.35 | \$89.69 | \$44.70 | \$66.99 |
| Transportation | Form 3-J | Total | \$6,773,068 | \$6,290,409 | \$5,413,519 | \$5,343,271 | \$6,086,423 | \$7,790,500 | \$4,412,993 | \$6,015,740 |
| | | per mile | \$0.97 | \$0.88 | \$1.34 | \$0.74 | \$0.82 | \$1.32 | \$0.63 | \$0.96 |
| Total Operating Costs | | Total | \$15,695,193 | \$17,473,557 | \$16,050,891 | \$14,976,798 | \$17,286,734 | \$19,450,213 | \$11,422,201 | \$16,050,798 |
| | | per ton | \$31.22 | \$34.75 | \$31.92 | \$29.79 | \$34.38 | \$38.68 | \$22.72 | \$31.92 |

| Table 3 Facility Staffing | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| Area | Reference | Allied Waste | BEST | Greenstar | Hudson Baylor | Norcal | Republic | South Bay | Average |
| Transfer Station | Form 3 - G | 22.5 | 32.1 | 20.0 | 24.9 | 33.2 | 23.0 | 24.4 | 25.7 |
| MRF Processing | Form 3 - G | 44.8 | 52.9 | 40.3 | 40.9 | 61.6 | 63.5 | 36.3 | 48.6 |
| Transport | Form 3 - G | 33.2 | 28.3 | 29.2 | 28.9 | 27.5 | 39.0 | 25.1 | 30.2 |
| Management/Administration | Form 3 - G | 4.0 | 12.5 | 6.0 | 9.0 | 8.0 | 17.0 | 6.0 | 8.9 |
| Total Staffing | Total FTE's | 104.5 | 125.8 | 95.5 | 103.7 | 130.3 | 142.5 | 91.8 | 113.4 |

| Table 4 Facility Equipment Costs (2008 dollars) | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Item | Reference | Allied Waste | BEST | Greenstar | Hudson Baylor | Norcal | Republic | South Bay | Average |
| Contractor Proposed Capital and Equipment (2008 dollars) | Form 3 - C | \$850,000 | \$1,622,990 | \$886,844 | \$1,735,000 | \$1,585,753 | \$1,730,000 | \$591,250 | \$1,285,977 |
| MRF Processing | Form 3 - C | \$565,000 | \$928,125 | \$973,306 | \$924,000 | \$1,012,196 | \$135,000 | \$1,042,306 | \$797,133 |
| Transportation | Form 3 - C | \$4,605,000 | \$3,584,343 | \$5,094,961 | \$3,425,000 | \$3,427,627 | \$3,341,529 | \$3,530,717 | \$3,858,454 |
| Other, Buy Back, Maintenance, Support, etc. | Form 3 - C | \$411,247 | \$942,495 | \$415,994 | \$305,000 | \$277,000 | \$713,004 | \$450,108 | \$502,121 |
| Total Contractor Capital | Total | \$6,431,247 | \$7,077,953 | \$7,371,105 | \$6,389,000 | \$6,302,576 | \$5,919,533 | \$5,614,381 | \$6,443,685 |
| Interest Rate | Form 3 - M | 5.0% | 5.5% | 11% / 13.9% | 7.5% | 7.0% | 10.0% | 5.0% | 6.7% |
| 10 Year Total Interest Payments | Form 3 - M | \$1,754,355 | \$2,304,246 | \$5,481,126 | \$2,395,875 | \$2,628,154 | \$3,255,743 | \$1,659,029 | \$2,782,647 |
| Total Contractor Fixed Cost (Capital & Interest) | | \$8,185,602 | \$9,382,199 | \$12,852,231 | \$8,784,875 | \$8,930,730 | \$9,175,276 | \$7,273,410 | \$9,226,332 |

| Table 5 MRF Processing Equipment (2008 dollars) | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Item | Reference | Allied Waste | BEST | Greenstar | Hudson Baylor | Norcal | Republic | South Bay | Average |
| MRF Processing Equipment | Form 4 - B.4 | \$12,356,441 | \$13,993,039 | \$15,019,205 | \$17,479,188 | \$13,070,223 | \$13,332,638 | \$13,730,447 | \$14,140,169 |
| MRF Installation & Start-up | Form 4 - B.2 | \$2,808,920 | \$4,693,800 | \$3,595,000 | \$2,325,000 | \$4,008,780 | \$3,570,000 | \$3,412,802 | \$3,487,757 |
| MRF Equipment Costs - Paid by SBWMA | Total | \$15,165,361 | \$18,686,839 | \$18,614,205 | \$19,804,188 | \$17,079,003 | \$16,902,638 | \$17,143,249 | \$17,627,926 |
| Equipment Manufacture | | BHS | CP | Van Dyk | Van Dyk | Machinex | CP | BHS | |
| Optional Equipment Costs | Form 4 - B.3 | \$1,417,709 | \$773,098 | \$800,000 | \$418,000 | \$839,420 | \$2,312,935 | \$618,567 | \$1,025,676 |