

**Solid Waste Alternatives Program Advisory Council
Urbandale Public Library
September 2, 2009: 9 a.m.**

Minutes

9:00 a.m. Meeting Begins

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

Approval of Agenda

DECISION ITEM

Add discussion of recycling task force.

Motion and 2 nd to approve agenda as amended. Unanimous approval
--

Approval of Minutes

DECISION ITEM

- 7-20-2009

Motion and 2 nd to approve minutes. Unanimous approval
--

Recycling Task Force (amended in) Brian Tormey

Legislation put together this 31 voting member task force. Task is to develop a report with recommendations on how we can establish comprehensive sustainable recycling in the State of Iowa. We've hired a facilitator to assist us.

We will recommend focusing on 4 sectors: Residential/consumer, commercial, industrial, institutional.

Current/emergent issues, environmental impacts, economics (funding), etc.

They have a steep learning curve.

We are doing presentations at the next meeting: recycling, comprehensive planning, and business assistance programs in/out of the department. Also – they want to know what EMS is. Sara is gone, so she can't speak. Mary: (9-24-09) 20 minute presentation with 10 minutes for questions at the Botanical Center. Yes she can speak. Tony – You need a commercial/industrial recycling sector person representing on the panel.

This is just an overview of what is currently in place.

In October we want a national overview.

Becky will email Mary the PowerPoint from our workshop.

Brian will be presenting an EMS discussion to the EPC (9-15-09) as an information item. (Brian will send out prior to presenting it.)

RFP Applications review/discussion (due 8-25-09)

DECISION ITEM

- Scoring (sent to Becky by 9-1-09)
- Follow-up Interviews?
- How do we score the interviews?

Using total scores here is the breakdown.

First: GS&P

Second: RMT

Third: GETF

Sign In

Solid Waste Alternatives Program Advisory Council

Urbandale Public Library

9/2/2009 9:00 a.m.

Name	Representing/Organization
Angie Clark	Iowa DNR
Becky Jolly	Iowa DNR
Tony Calosimo	AWA / NS WMA
Cestic Goldsmith	IDNA
Nathan Ohrt	Barker Lemar
Jeff Phillips	..
Sherry Tenney	IDEB
Scott Smith	CI WMA
Mary Witting	ISOSWO
Tom Hadden	MWA
Laura Fittick	Franklin Gresham
Kathy Morris	Waste Comm of Scott County
Jen Jordan	Iowa Recycling Association
Sara Brink	So. Central Iowa Solid Waste
Brian Tomney	DNR
Shelley Bodner	IWE
Kim Howell	Think Green Iowa
Clifton Murove	Think Green Iowa

Fourth: URS

Should we interview the top 2 since there seems to be a natural break?

Motion and 2 nd to interview the top 2 scores (GS&P and RMT) Unanimous Approval

Interview Questions:

Interview Dates: (Scope of work due 9-28 for October meeting). September 18, 2009.

Becky will check with RMT on their availability. 9:00 a.m.

It is a public meeting if the entire council wants to be involved.

Interview questions will be customized for each applicant? There may be a couple of common questions, and then some specific to each applicant.

If we don't want it public we could have a small interview team ask the questions and then take it back to the council. They wouldn't make the decision themselves.

We don't have 5 people not wanting to sit in on the council....so we just need to do it as a whole council and understand that it is a public meeting.

For the question process we could go back and forth asking the questions.

For the most part they will still answer their questions their own way. If they are busy trying to change their answers then they probably won't be successful anyway.

Each member could ask a question. We just want to talk to the people we'd be working with.

Allow an hour and a half for each firm. 9 and 10:30 (we flipped a coin to decide who goes first.)

9-18-09

RMT at 9:00

GS&P at 10:30

Interview scoring: We will have one discussion after both interviews are complete.

Everyone has a vote and majority rules. We will make a decision that day...a recommendation for EPC. (for October meeting).

On your original scoring...you can change your scoring after the interviews have provided some clarification. This allows more transparency on our selection. Look at your low score(s) and ask the questions based upon your scoring...then adjust as necessary. Becky doesn't need these until we make a final decision. Adjust your scoring after the interviews as necessary.

Pilot Application Scoring Matrix (Shelly, Sara, Leslie)

DECISION ITEM

Shelly/Leslie: We are looking for the most diverse group. We want to chart the programs that they have now, compare budgets, goal progress, etc. It's difficult to rank because we want differences.

We charted them. We tried to put background information in, and did different sorts.

The list stays pretty much the same through out. Differences are # of programs, goal progress, and physical location in the state.

We have some significant breaks on population served. We need to define small medium and large and then take the ones with the most going on and the least going on. We are not discriminating, so it's difficult to determine.

The 6 pilots were for last year. Technically by now we should be allowed to add others in. Can we expand it to allow all 8? But the consultant budget gets changed, and some people would have applied had they known this.

Maybe after reading through the applications we'll find some that aren't in it for the right reason. In SWAP there are people that apply that are applying just for money and it doesn't meet our criteria.

EMS is to increase environmental protection.

We want some differences, but there are so many different ways to decide what gives us the best mix.

We want to look at how they are going to continuously improve.

Sort based upon answer to #7. Continuous improvement

Separate them based upon size and then look at their continuous improvement.

We could have everyone rank each pilot 1-8...based on what is important to that particular council member. Then we could look at how it breaks down.

All 8 are good projects it's hard to weed them out.

Everyone needs to read back through the legislation to see what it is expected. If we rank them 1-8 and there is a natural break then we take that many...whether it is 4 or 7 for example. We have criteria...but we're not just looking for those high performers.

6 is an arbitrary number. We want a range that is workable...that was why the legislation picked that number.

If we rank them...then what if the numbers come out, and we don't have any large population areas...then that is contrary to our purpose.

We need to look at their applications...is it complete does it answer what we need.

Question #7 is where they make their argument.

Do we need a standardized approach to making the selection? Is it possible? No. We do need to have a large, medium, and small represented. Will that shake out by reading the applications?

People may try to make a case at EPC if they aren't selected. For this reason we need some criteria.

We look at question #7 (level of commitment). "Hunger to make a change."

We gave them the criteria, that's the data we want from them to help us assess.

Leslie can send out the spreadsheet of their answers.

Everyone review each applicant on basis of the criteria and list out a 1-8 ranking. At the next meeting we will discuss the applications and use a group effort to narrow down to the 6 recommended participants.

Take the criteria and come up with a 1-8 listing on each criteria.

By 10-1-09 the legislation talks about adding additional to the 6 pilots.

Do our own ranking and then it will come down to the discussion and our opinion...we will just have to discuss it. We just need to have our reasons for who gets picked...leave the door open to pick 7 if we can't clearly justify not taking someone. We need to go through the process to justify who we pick.

Homework – go through pilot applications and come back with our individual recommendations. We will discuss this at length to make our decision. (make your decision based on the criteria).

We have to defend our process.

Conflict of Interest review.

You can't review your own applications. How far do we want to take it? What about financial interest.

Disclosure:

Sara can't review Rathbun's. (contract)

Tom can't review his own.

Jen? She doesn't have a financial interest and is not a contractor. She's OK to review Cedar Rapids/Linn County.

Tony can't review Metro's. (contractor)

Scheduling Future Meetings

INFORMATION

- Interviews may be performed between September 2nd and 17th.
- September 17, 2009, 1 p.m., West Des Moines Public Library, 4000 Mills Civic Pkwy, West Des Moines, IA 2nd Floor Classroom
 - Pilot applications review/discussion/selection (due 8-31-09)
 - Review and make your own notes
 - RFP application selection
- September 18, 2009
 - 9:00: RMT
 - 10:30: GS&P
 - Prepare questions to ask of each firm. (this is a public meeting)
Council discussion and selection of proposal.
 - Recommendations for Pilot and RFP will go to the Oct. 20th EPC.

Future Agenda Items

- Presentations by those with resources. (Al Bonini, etc.)
- When does the 5 year comprehensive plan cycle start?
- Definition of Small/Medium/Large Planning Area/Landfills
- How to disseminate/share successes/problems learned from this process (another workshop?)
- Annual Report: Content, Criteria, Enforcement for no progress (put this info in rulemaking?)
- Timeline of pilots? When will more be added on?
- Chair elected for one year. (Sara elected 1-6-2009)

Adjourn

DECISION ITEM

Motion and 2 nd to Adjourn Unanimous Approval

Homework

- Becky will email Mary the PowerPoint from our workshop.
- Becky will check with RMT on their availability at 9:00 a.m. on 9-18-09.
- Leslie can send out the spreadsheet summary of the pilot answers.
- Homework – go through pilot applications and come back with our individual recommendations. (make your decision based on the criteria).
- Becky will check to see when Sara was elected Chair of the council.