

Sign In

Solid Waste Alternatives Program Advisory Council

Urbandale Public Library

5/1/2009 9:00 a.m.

Name	Representing/Organization
Angie Clark	Iowa DNR
Becky Jolly	Iowa DNR
Nathan Ohrt	Banker Lemar
Shelene Codner	IWE
Scott Smith	CIWA
Leslie Goldsmith	IDNR
Tom Hadden	MWA
Mary Linnus	DEO
Jen Jordan	IRA
Sara Bixby	SCJWA
Duan Toung	DNR
Tony Colosimp	AWS

**Solid Waste Alternatives Program Advisory Council
Urbandale Public Library
May 1, 2009: 9 a.m.**

Minutes

Mary Wittry – Absent (excused for a funeral) – RFQ scores were submitted prior to the meeting.

9:00 a.m. Meeting Begins

9:15 a.m. Public Participation Period (3 Minutes Per Person)

Approval of Agenda

DECISION ITEM

Mary Wittry Email – Since nothing was received from Tony, regarding the decision item on a Policy Statement on speaking on behalf of the council, it is moved that this topic be tabled until next meeting.

Motion to approve the agenda with tabling the policy statement on speaking on behalf of the council until next meeting.

Motion and 2 nd to approve as amended Unanimous Approval
--

Approval of Minutes (3-9-09)

DECISION ITEM

No discussion

Motion and 2 nd to approve Unanimous Approval

Policy Statement - Speaking on behalf of the council - Tony

DECISION ITEM

Tabled until the next meeting.

Public Comments

Brian Tormey - We were notified by email that at least one person will be here representing one of the firms that submitted an RFQ. FYI

DNR update at ISOSWO conference - does Brian need to present the EMS update?

Yes.

What is the Council's message?

DECISION ITEM

Is there a public position we want to take? Can this wait now that legislature is not in session? It'd be good to speak with Donovan on his vision and if we are moving in the direction he intended.

Scott Smith is attempting to get a hold of him and will find out his ability to come to the next meeting and the workshop. (Agenda structured to have him speak on his message and discuss the workshop with him too).

Tabled until Next Meeting.

Motion and 2 nd to table this to next meeting Unanimous Approval
--

Tony Colosimo – arrival 9:20

Workshop

- Agenda

DECISION ITEM

Review of the bare bones agenda – We need a discussion on who is doing what. (See **updated agenda**)

Workshop Agenda:

Becky/Angie – Registrations

Sara – Moderator, logistics reminder and intro into Donovan’s discussion

Introduction of council members.

Solid Waste Environmental Management Systems – BrianTormey. Explain that we’re moving towards the next steps. (May 11th we can flush this out after we’ve talked about what is our message?)

Adjust the order of the agenda “What is the Council looking for?” will be moved up for Sara to discuss. She’ll also discuss the council’s process here.

Comp plans – why, what, incentives, penalties,...transition to EMS. Typically what it is, what it is specifically to the council. Why/how we make the transition. Who does it.

What doesn’t change. Who, When, How.

Then into the next agenda item. EMS to enhance the programs/philosophies DNR already has.

Need to **send a reminder** on Workshop registration deadline.

Q&A Session- (Mostly Sara and Brian)

There may be a lot of logistical questions. Keep it clear that the morning session is on the concept of EMS. Afternoon is to discuss the application process. Do we need this? We could only have the one question session? We need people to understand what an EMS is. If they are lost, they need to be able to answer those questions before moving on. (general agreement)

Afternoon appropriate questions, will be just put on hold until after lunch.

Sara/Brian/Donovan to speak in the morning.

Name tags for the council members. (Shelly, Jen, Angie)

Afternoon agenda:

Money distribution – we need more information. **We will this discuss next meeting.**

Move Components up...then we move down to process/procedures.

Components – Scott Smith

Process/Procedures – Shelly/Leslie, application (**page limit on the application form?**

May 11th agenda item) Also we will talk about **goal progress decisions at the workshop.**

May 11th discussion for the council. The DNR is considering ways to do goal progress...No determinations made, unless the planning area requests it. We don’t want a mixed message out there. We will leave it at that. If they are not a pilot, then eventually we will make the determination. DNR is crafting a letter it’s just for a few months until the pilots get picked. This is a DNR issue, not a council issue. (A very limited number of Planning areas will be effected.) As a pilot project their fees change.

We need to discuss the letter that goes out, in connection with the Pilot Program at the workshop. (This also goes along with the council's message)

A successful EMS program will improve the environment of Iowa. - is this our message? Negative results aren't always a bad thing. That's how we learn.

At the next meeting we need to flush out each of our individual discussions so we can go through the workshop agenda of what each person is going to say.

Give Scott ideas on component examples, to help show that small areas can do it too.

Break

- Resource list

DECISION ITEM

Send Shelly thoughts on resources to provide as samples at the workshop. This could be discussed during Scott's portion. Leslie is the resource contact. Send her any ideas you have.

RFQ Questions/Responses Overview

INFORMATION

See RFQ Responses to questions.

No questions or comments.

Review Qualifications

- Notify qualified applicants

DECISION ITEM

We are determining the universe of who we're going to speak with more.

Let's talk about what we want, prior to looking at the numbers. And talk about conflict of interest. Then we'll hand out the summary score sheets.

Out of 10, how many do we want to review? We should set a goal...target number. We set a number, understanding that we aren't locked on that number.

5 – a lot of quality and mixed positives. 3 would narrow it down too much.

Interviews?

Have 5, then interview 3? What about budget?

Let's try to get it down to 5, then revisit if we want to change the number.

Are we just weeding out those that aren't qualified. To us, they are all qualified.

Shelly's reviewed showed that...but our scores and discussion will narrow them down.

Does anyone have concerns about conflict of interests?

Who has worked with who before?

Scott S. - Foth: Did a study for Boone Co. landfill, and worked with Scott as a consultant. Shaw: consultants in Chicago. And CIWMA consultants.

Shelly: Has not worked directly for them. Works with Barker and Foth on Waste exchange as a resource.

Sara – Has worked for Foth and they are now her engineer.

Jen – ERM? And Foth and Barker have sponsored activates for Iowa Recycling Association. DSM has worked with ECICOG

Tom – Work with Foth and Barker

Tony – Indirectly has worked with Foth and Barker

Leslie - Barker was a consultant at Prairie

DNR – Foth, Barker, and Shaw

If we disqualify them, we should've done this ahead of time. The companies have conflicts with who's going to apply...but we don't know who is going to apply. Nathan Ohrt (Barker Lemar) – Barker has worked with many companies. Barker is working with ICF as the lead, we are the secondary team. ICF will do the evaluation work...Barker will work specifically with the pilots in developing the components. If we've worked with any of the council, that doesn't mean there will be favoritism. ICF has no conflicts on the process, policy, and framework.

How can we refuse a company on the presumption that they *may* have a conflict?
 Tony – there's too many conflicts with the company and the council.

There are 2 types:

- Is there a Council bias for or against a company to excuse you from the scoring.
 - There are some we can't judge unbiased...throw those scores out.
- Is there a conflict of interest between them and current clients that are a concern?

Options for decisions

- Everyone participate for all firms, regardless of conflicts/ties/etc. We're just narrowing the field down.
- Throw out anyone from participating that has a possible conflict. (Sherry will be the only one left to decide)
- If you have a conflict with a particular consultant, you don't review that consultant....numbers are on an average basis of number of submittals.

We can discuss the merits of the applications without our conflicts being an issue. But what about the bias?

Proposal to use everyone's scores.

Proposal to use everyone's scores, but can exclude a company based on if they have a conflict. But we won't know this. Also what capacity is the conflict in?

The conflict of interest statement says the member would exclude themselves rather than exclude firms.

We are taking the top 5. We'll look at everyone's numbers.

Weight numbers 1-10.

Average Total Score		Average Weighted Score (1 st choice = 1 point)	
Global Environment & Technology Foundation (GETF)	81.67	Gresham, Smith, and Partners (GS&P)	3.50
Gresham, Smith, and Partners (GS&P)	79.11	Global Environment & Technology Foundation (GETF)	3.94
URS Corporation	77.56	ICF Incorporated, L.L.C. and Barker Lemar Engineering Consultants	4.56
RMT, Inc.	74.22	URS Corporation	5.11
Shaw Environmental, Inc.	71.11	Foth Infrastructure & Environment, LLC	5.11
Environmental Resources Management	70.22	RMT, Inc.	5.67
ICF Incorporated, L.L.C. and Barker Lemar Engineering Consultants	70.22	Shaw Environmental, Inc.	6.00

DSM Environmental Services, Inc.	69.89	Environmental Resources Management	6.44
Foth Infrastructure & Environment, LLC	68.78	DSM Environmental Services, Inc.	7.06
WIH Resource Group and Bell & Associates, Inc.	62.33	WIH Resource Group and Bell & Associates, Inc.	7.61

Discuss rankings/decision

5 firms compared to the other way of ranking that we just went through there are 3 that are consistent in the top 4.

Gresham, GETF, URS.

Move to invite GETF, Gresham, URS, ICF, and RMT to submit proposals

Moved and 2nd for the 5 names.

Discussion:

Tony disagrees with ICF because of conflicts. Our statement says council members have conflicts, not firms.

Vote – Invite GETF, Gresham, URS, ICF, and RMT to submit proposals

Tony - Nay

Leslie - Yay

Jen - Yay

Mary - Absent

Sara - Yay

Scott - Yay

Shelly - Yay

Sherry - Yay

Tom - Yay

Motion Carries

Move to invite GETF, Gresham, URS, ICF, and RMT to submit proposals

Motion and 2nd to approve
Approval based on majority

Vote: 7 to 1 with one absent member. 5 firms are invited to submit a request for proposal.

Becky will send out notifications.

RFP - Leslie

DISCUSSION ITEM

We need more information on the budget/funding section. Did we decide on a 12 month contract? "Up to" \$600,000 is available per fiscal year." This money is for pilots, council, council administration, consultant, etc. So it's more than just the pilots.

Do we want budgets turned in the same way for easier comparison?

Discussion of how much money to specify: Do we include a number? We could give a percentage. We could say the estimated budget, but portion will be used for administrative reasons. We need to give a budget range.

\$200,000 is a number that's been thrown out. The dollar amount depends on the scoring criteria and how much weight we give to each area. We chose a number, get responses, and the details they respond with gives us comparative analysis.

DNR usually tries to get a dollar amount into the RFP's to give some sort of a number.

Motion to include in the RFP: not to exceed \$225,000 budgeted for 12 months (with the ability to extend if necessary)

Motion and 2 nd to approve Unanimous Approval

Leslie will do some more work now that we have the budget narrowed down. After scoring the RFQ's it will be easier to apply some of that framework into the RFP. A small group will work on this for the next meeting. (Sara, Jen, and Leslie)

Send Leslie thoughts on the selection criteria by 5-4-09.

- Discuss Timeline. (EPC items due 8-24-09 to go to September EPC meeting.)
- Out 5-29-09 is the goal.
- Needs approval at the 5-11 meeting

Process and Distribution of Funds

DISCUSSION ITEM

This is what we just talked about. Budget for the RFP

Tom Anderson (DNR) is speaking next time to talk about how the money flow to the pilots will work. Brian will speak with Tom ahead of time.

How the money can be used still hasn't really been decided yet.

Scheduling Future Meetings

INFORMATION

- May 11, 2009, 9 a.m.; Urbandale Public Library be prepared for a full day.
 - Policy Statement - Speaking on behalf of the council – Tony
 - What is the Council's message? – Donovan Olson
 - Goal Progress Moratorium Brian/Leslie
 - Setting page limits on the pilot application form.
 - Presentations for workshops prepared
 - Workshop Agenda
 - Tom Anderson to discuss SWAP reimbursements: Process for distribution of money. (workshop agenda item)
 - RFP
- May 28, 2009, 9a.m. check in: Hilton Garden Inn -EMS Information Session

Adjourn

DECISION ITEM

Motion and 2 nd to approve Unanimous Approval

Homework

- Scott Smith is attempting to get a hold of Donovan and will find out his ability to come to the next meeting and the workshop.
- Name tags for the council members. Who they are, where they are from – for everyone (Jen Jordan and Shelly will help Angie with name tags).
- Need to send a reminder on Workshop registration deadline. -Becky
- We need to flush out each of our individual discussions so we can go through the workshop agenda of what each person is going to say.
- Email good component examples to Scott. (little areas can do it too)

- Send Shelly thoughts on resources to provide as samples at the workshop. (handout or as part of presentation?)
- Sara, Jen, and Leslie to work on RFP
- Send Leslie thoughts on the selection criteria/scoring criteria ASAP. (COB 5-4)
- Give Becky your official score sheets (with comments) for public record.

Future Agenda Items

- Presentations by those with resources. (Al Bonini, etc.)