

COUNCIL WORK SESSION
TUESDAY
12 OCTOBER, 2010
5:30 P.M. – 7:30 P.M.
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER

1. Presentation Phase II for White Street Landfill. (Develop decision matrix and approve information requirements for presentations.)

Attachments will be provided in this week's IFYI and will be available for viewing by the public in the City Clerk's office.

Prior to the date of the briefing, contact Channel 13 at 333-6922 if you have electronic presentations.

Any individual with a disability who needs an interpreter or other auxiliary aids or services for this meeting may contact the City Clerk's Office at 373-2397 or 333-6930 (TDD).

Office of the City Manager
City of Greensboro



October 7, 2010

TO: Mayor and Members of Council

FROM: Robert W. Morgan, Deputy City Manager

SUBJECT: Matrix and Presentation Requirements for Solid Waste Disposal Proposals

Enclosed is a proposed matrix for the City Council's review that will be used to evaluate the proposals for solid waste disposal, as well as a Presentation Outline that will be provided to each respondent to the RFP to use in preparation for his/her presentation. We request that the City Council review both documents and provide feedback. Once agreement of the evaluation criteria is reached, then Council should assign a weighting factor to each of the criterion.

The Presentation Outline is based on the proposed selection criteria to ease in the evaluation of the proposals. Based upon a two-day interview process, it is suggested that each respondent be given 30 minutes for a presentation and 20 minutes for questions.

Following Council's deliberations on October 12, the respondents to the RFP will be notified of the process and requested to respond by October 20 if they are interested in making a presentation. If their answer is affirmative, they will be required to provide a copy of their presentation to the City by November 3.

Since Council suggested at their last meeting that the interviews be conducted in two days, members should come prepared to set the dates for the interviews on October 12th. Council members may want to consider the following:

- Weekday or weekend
- Back to back days or separated dates
- November, December or January.

If you have questions, please contact me.

RWM/nls
Enclosure

cc: Rashad M. Young, City Manager

Evaluation of Solid Waste Management Strategies

City of Greensboro, NC

DRAFT 10-6-10, V2

The purpose of this Decision Matrix is to 1) Identify important criteria related to determining the best solid waste management strategy moving forward, 2) assign a weighting factor to each criteria, and then 3) grade each offerer for each criteria by assigning a value from zero up to but not exceeding the weighting factor. The weighting factors should be assigned such that the sum of all factors is 100. The graded values will be totaled for each respondent. Note that many of the responses are not adequately detailed to assign a proper grade for each criteria (example: some responses did not include specific financial offerings). Also, some respondents offered more than one option related to solid waste management for the City. These issues will need to be resolved before completing the decision matrix.

	City Assigned Weighting Factor (Total = 100)	Advanced Disposal	CICO	Herzog	MRR Southern	Republic Services	Uturnagen	Waste Connections	Waste Industries	Waste Management
1 Qualifications and Experience of the Respondent Qualifications and experience of the Company, Company's staff, teaming partners and subcontractors. Demonstrated experience with projects of similar type and magnitude. History of successful project implementation.										
2 Financial Offering to the City Life cycle costs to City, tipping fee structure, escalators, up front cash payments, assumption of current financial liabilities, lease payments, royalties or host fees.										
3 Company Financial Depth and Stability Demonstrated ability to meet stated goals of the proposal and fund project implementation. Favorable borrowing and insurance capacity, funding mechanisms, track record on funding similar projects. Financial strength is adequate as related to capital and operating cost of system implementation.										
4 Viability of Proposed Technology Proposed technology is valid and performance has been demonstrated on previous projects (perhaps by others) using similar feedstock and throughput levels.										
5 Reference Facilities, Operational Experience and Regulatory Track Record Company/team/key staff have developed similar facilities, and have demonstrated successful operation and management of similar facilities with sound regulatory compliance and environmental track record. Company can provide and meet performance guarantees using proposed technology.										
6 Implementation Schedule Company has outlined a realistic implementation schedule and terms of service related to the waste management strategies proposed, and schedule is consistent with the City's needs and expectations.										
7 Use of City Assets Does Company require use of City property, landfill capacity, or other assets? If so, how does offer impact those assets, including potential remaining life of the landfill? (Council will need to determine if use of City assets is viewed as a positive or negative attribute and revise this wording accordingly).										
8 Service Area Does respondents offer utilize City and County waste, or expand service area beyond County limits? (Council will need to determine if expansion of the service area beyond Guilford County is a positive or negative attribute and revise this wording accordingly).										
9 Integration of System Components Does offerer propose to manage only MSW disposal, or are other components enhanced, such as increasing recycling or diverting waste?										
10 Environmental Impacts of Proposed Technology Impacts including surface and groundwater, air emissions, and legacy impacts that exist after facility closure. (Lower environmental impact means higher score for respondent).										
11 Community Concerns Potential for impacts including traffic, odors, noise, affect on property values. (Less negative community impact means higher score for respondent).										
12 Economic Development Potential for project to positively impact local economy by addition of jobs, future development, etc. Impact to current solid waste staff jobs?										
13										

Total Score

100

Presentation Outline

Each respondent will be given 30 minutes to make a presentation. Following the presentation the Council will have 20 minutes for questions. In order to ensure consistent information is received during the presentations, respondents are requested to cover the following information in a PowerPoint format:

- Introductions
- Brief summary of offering
 - Landfill, energy conversion technology, etc.
- Qualifications and Experience
 - Explain the experience of the Company, Company's staff, teaming partners and subcontractors. Discuss experience with projects of similar type and magnitude and history of successful project implementation.
- Company Resources and Financial Strength
 - Explain Company's depth of resources and financial stability, ability to finance the proposed project, history of similar project financing experience.
- Financial Offering to the City
 - Explanation of life cycle costs to City, tipping fee structure, escalators, up front cash payments, assumption of current financial liabilities, lease payments, royalties, host fees, community investment, etc.
- Explanation of Proposed Waste Management System
 - Overview of proposed strategy, implementation schedule, technology to be employed, with demonstrated performance on previous projects. Discuss ability to meet performance guarantees.
- Reference Facilities and Operational Experience
 - Discuss reference facilities (preferably developed by respondent) that use proposed technology with similar feedstock and throughput level as that proposed for the City. Discuss Company's experience in managing and operating similar facilities, as well as regulatory and environmental track record.
- Community Concerns
 - Explain how the Company intends to address community concerns.
- Deviations from Original Response
 - The City has reviewed the written responses provided by each offerer. Describe any differences that may exist between the written response received March 1, 2010 and this presentation.
- Summary and Wrap Up
 - Summarize qualities which you believe differentiate your offer from others.
- Questions and Answers
 - Council will ask questions following the formal presentation.