RECOMMENDED ACTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

Status report regarding Solid Waste Co-Composting project, possible approval of preferred vendor of technology, possible approval of additional travel for Board-approved team members to further investigate the viability of the selected vendor technology, and appropriation of necessary funds from Solid Waste Enterprise Contingency Funds for the travel expenses.

The co-compost team will meet on May 11 and will present their findings and recommendations to the Board (see attached meeting memo and minutes of the last team meeting).

If one of the two vendors is preferred, it will likely be necessary to visit other representative facilities to adequately determine the viability of their technology. The two representative facilities visited to date did not fully demonstrate each vendors' capabilities.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF BOARD ACTIONS:

A status report was last provided to the Board on March 3, 1998.

LIST ALTERNATIVES AND CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Alternatives will be presented at the Board meeting.

---

COSTS:

A. Budgeted current FY> $ 
B. Total anticipated Costs> $ 
C. Required additional funding> $ 
D. Internal transfers> $ 

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:
List the attachments and number the pages consecutively:

1. April 30, 1998 memo, Edwards to Co-compost review
   team with attachments

---

*Costs will be provided at the Board meeting

---

Clerk's Use Only

Res. No.: 98-175 Ord. No.: 
Vote - Ayes: Noes: 
Absent: 

☐ Approved ☐ Denied 
☐ Minute Order Attached ☐ No Action Necessary

The foregoing instrument is a correct copy of the original on file in this office

Date: 
ATTEST: MARGIE WILLIAMS, Clerk of the Board

By: Deputy

Administrative Officer's Recommendation:

This item on agenda as:

☐ Recommended ☐ Not Recommended
☐ For Policy Determination
☐ Submitted with Comment
☐ Returned for Further Action

Comment:

C.A.O. Initials:
Recommendations from the MSW Co-Compost Selection Team

1. Eliminate Bedminster Bioconversion Corporation from further consideration as a viable technology/vendor.

2. Select HUWS Corporation/Herhof as the preferred technology/vendor for further consideration and possible negotiations, depending upon additional investigations by the team.

3. Authorize the team to continue investigation of other comparable technologies in order to broaden general County understanding. This will include additional domestic travel to visit other facilities in July or August. Staff will return to the Board with specific recommendations and funding appropriations in the near future.

4. Direct staff and the team to develop a comprehensive public education program in this regard.

5. Set a time and date of 7:00 p.m., June 16, 1998 for a public workshop and meeting on this subject. It is proposed that the regular Board meeting of that date begin at 2:00 p.m. with a dinner break at 6:00 p.m.

6. It may be necessary to send County representatives to Germany to visit other Herhof facilities where they process MSW. To date, the team has not been able to confidently determine how well this technology is applicable to MSW co-composting, although it appears to hold the most promise. The team will report back to the Board in this regard.
MEMO

To: Co-Compost Review Team, See Distribution List*

From: Michael D. Edwards, Public Works Director

Subject: Co-Composting Meeting

The co-composting meeting that was originally scheduled for Wednesday, May 13, 1998 in El Portal, has been rescheduled for Monday, May 11, 1998 at 2:30 p.m. at the Yosemite Motels Central Office conference room (next to Board of Supervisors' office off of 6th Street in Mariposa). Attached are the minutes from the meeting of April 1, 1998.

Reports from the recent visit by the HUWS/Herhof group, as well as the northern California compost facilities review will be provided. Also, attached is additional information recently received from Bedminster. Our primary task will be to re-evaluate each of the two vendors (HUWS and Bedminster) based on recently acquired information. We should be prepared to recommend a preferred vendor, if appropriate, after re-evaluation. Additionally, we should consider whether it is necessary to visit other facilities of the preferred vendor.

An item has been scheduled for the Board meeting on the following day, May 12, to provide a status report and act on any recommendations from the team. You are invited to attend.

*Distribution List
Doug Balmain
Garry Parker
George Eowan
Tom Starling
Brian Hodge
Bill Delaney
Ed Walls
Mark Gallagher
Roger Formanek
Peter Ruggerello

Enclosures as noted

cc: Patti Reilly, District 1 Supervisor
Bob Stewart, District 3 Supervisor
Bob Pickard, District 5 Supervisor
April 27, 1998

Mr. Michael Edwards, Director
Mariposa County Public Works
4639 Bcn Hur Road
Mariposa, CA 95338

Dear Mike:

We would like to take this opportunity to thank you for inviting Bedminster and the McCliер Corporation to participate in the County’s procurement process for a co-composting facility. Both companies look forward to partnering with the County and the Park to develop a project that will best serve the needs of the residents of Mariposa County and visitors to Yosemite National Park.

BEDMINSTER UPDATE

The Cobb County, GA facility is scheduled to open in early June and the Marlborough, MA facility is expected to open this Fall. Construction of the Edmonton, Alberta, Canada facility began this Spring. The construction of the Port Stephens, Australia project is expected to begin by July and construction of the Miami, Florida and Stora Vika, Sweden projects will begin by year’s end. If Bedminster is the selected technology for the Mariposa Project, we expect that members of your project team will want to learn the design details of these projects and, in fact, may want to visit some or all of them.

MARIPOSA PROJECT

Cost Reduction Opportunities

We have previously submitted several cost reduction ideas for the Mariposa Project. Some entail changes in the facility’s financing and ownership plan. Others suggest modifications to the process design. Once chosen as the selected technology, Bedminster’s intention is to encourage discussion of the various alternatives with the County and Park, with the objective of jointly deciding which should be explored in more detail. The final decision whether or not to adopt these alternatives would also be made by all partners in the project.

Market Potential for Compost

Hopefully, the evaluation committee has been able to confirm the vast market that exists for quality compost within an economical trucking distance from the Mariposa Project site. To summarize, we are aware that the market is anxious for a dependable supply of high quality compost with consistent nutrient levels, features that compost made from source separated...
CO-COMPOSTING MEETING

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 1, 1998
10:00 a.m.
Yosemite National Park Admin. Center

Attendees:  Mike Edwards, Public Works
            Tom Starling, Public Works
            Bill Delaney, Yosemite National Park
            Mark Gallagher, Yosemite National Park
            George Eowan, Integrated Recycling Inc.
            Brian Hodge, Environmental Health
            Don Holm, LEA
            Roger Formanek, Integrated Waste Management Board
            Ed Walls, Yosemite National Park (Chief of Maintenance)
            Don Fox, Yosemite National Park (Interim Chief of Design)

The meeting was called to order at 10:20 a.m. Bill Delaney introduced Ed Walls and Don Fox to the group.

Mike Edwards made introductory remarks and noted three possible recommendations that the team could make today: 1) "Go or no go"; 2) select one of the proposers for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to begin negotiations; 3) continue evaluation of the two proposers with additional information requested as necessary. Mike introduced George Eowan.

George went over the background of the project using overhead presentation and addressed questions. Discussion was held regarding the value to the project of having a highly marketable compost product; it was held that this issue was of minor importance overall but that it must be marketed in some way for diversion credit. George continued his presentation focusing on where we are now in the process, remaining unresolved issues and options for how to proceed from here. Ed asked about sludge acceptance and potential tip fees for sludge at a new facility. The team members responded. Discussion ensued by the team on the two proposers, pros/cons and summary of unanswered questions. He rephrased the three options for proceeding; 1) re-score, select vendor and begin negotiations; 2) request new bid from the two proposers; and 3) select firm and go to negotiations. Roger offered a fourth option: select "preferred vendor" and solicit further information. Bill noted that the solicitation (under federal guidelines) would be thrown out if we change the project assumptions. He suggested that we re-evaluate both vendors before determining course of action. Further discussion was held on these points. Mike suggested that the team consider the first option but request extra information from both proposers. More discussion was held on this possibility, the potential of another meeting with both vendors, the possibility of reviewing other California facilities (ones that have no vested interest in the RFP process) to help clarify goals and objectives, any other issues related to continued solicitation.

Break for lunch at 1:00 p.m.

Add #3
MARIPOSA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

MINUTE ORDER

TO: MIKE EDWARDS, Public Works Director

FROM: MARGIE WILLIAMS, Clerk of the Board

SUBJECT: Status Report Regarding Solid Waste Co-Composting Project; Res. 98-175

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF MARIPOSA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA,

ADOPTED THIS Order on May 12, 1998

ACTION AND VOTE:

9:45 a.m. E) Status Report Regarding Solid Waste Co-Composting Project, Possible Approval of Preferred Vendor of Technology, Possible Approval of Additional Travel for Board Approved Team Members to Further Investigate Viability of Selected Vendor Technology, and Appropriation of Necessary Funds from Solid Waste Enterprise Contingency for the Travel Expenses (4/5ths Vote Required)

BOARD ACTION: Mike Edwards reviewed the status of the team’s consideration of the proposals submitted by Bedminster and HUWS. George Eowan gave a presentation on the process used by the team to get to this stage and options for proceeding to obtain a mixed solid waste compost facility. Discussion was held relative to recommendations presented by the team. (M)Pickard, (S)Stewart, Res. 98-175 adopted approving the following recommendations:

1) elimination of Bedminster Bioconversion Corporation from further consideration as a viable technology/vendor;
2) selection of HUWS Corporation/Herhof as the preferred technology/vendor for further consideration and possible negotiations, depending upon additional investigations by the team;
3) authorization for the team to continue investigation of other comparable technologies in order to broaden general County understanding. This will include additional domestic travel to visit other facilities in July or August. Staff will return to the Board with specific recommendations and funding appropriations in the near future;
4) direction for staff and the team to develop a comprehensive public education program in this regard;
5) June 16, 1998, at 7:00 p.m. was scheduled for a public workshop and meeting on this subject. Public Works Director advised that the Solid Waste Task Force members would be invited. Schedule the Board’s regular meeting to commence at 2:00 p.m. on June 16th with a dinner break at 6:00 p.m.; and
6) It may be necessary to send County representatives to Germany to visit other Herhof facilities where they process mixed solid waste (MSW). To date, the team has not been able to confidently determine how well this technology is applicable to
MSW co-composting, although it appears to hold the most promise. The team will report back to the Board in this regard.

Ayes: Unanimous.

cc: File