Item # 22

City of Carson City
Agenda Report

Date Submitted: June 18, 2010

Agenda Date Requested: July 1, 2010
Time Requested: 30 Minutes

To: Mayor and Supervisors
From: Public Works

Subject Title: Action to direct staff to proceed with negotiations with our regional neighbors for increasing the landfill waste stream and to proceed with negotiations with Recology for operation of the landfill and development of a phased waste recovery process to include a potential future waste to energy component. (Burnham)

Staff Summary: The Board will review waste management recovery possibilities for the Carson City Landfill. This action directs staff to further investigate working with our regional neighbors, Douglas County and South Lake Tahoe and others, for increasing the waste stream to the City landfill and to determine the feasibility and costs of waste recovery and to contract with Recology for operation of the landfill and a waste recovery facility which may include a future waste to energy component. There may be increased revenues for the general fund and the increased regional waste stream will mitigate the increased costs for waste recovery and waste to energy.

Type of Action Requested: (check one)

(____) Resolution (____) Ordinance
(_X__) Formal Action/Motion (____) Other (Specify)

Does This Action Require A Business Impact Statement: (___) Yes (_x_) No

Recommended Board Action: I move to direct staff to staff to proceed with negotiations with our regional neighbors for increasing the landfill waste stream and to proceed with negotiations with Recology for operation of the landfill and development of a phased waste recovery process to include a potential future waste to energy component.

Explanation for Recommended Board Action: Staff has evaluated current waste management practices and reviewed possible future options as noted below.

Existing Solid Waste Management Practices

The existing Carson City Sanitary Landfill, formerly the Ormsby Landfill, is located off Highway 50 at 3600 Flint Drive which is in the northeast section of Carson City, Nevada. The landfill, owned by Carson City, has been in operation since 1970 and is currently operated by the City. The landfill was operated by a contractor until July of 2000. At that time, Carson City Public Works was awarded the contract for operation of the landfill and has operated the landfill since that time, resulting in longer life span to the landfill and an income stream to the general fund.

Waste is hauled to the landfill by commercial waste haulers and private individuals. The majority of the waste, 85%, currently originates from Carson City with the remaining coming from the surrounding region including California. The landfill is located on approximately 210 acres of land which was granted to the City by the United States Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Current landfill operations utilize 83 of the 210 acres for waste placement.

The City, under the Federal Lands Bill, is acquiring the land surrounding the landfill from the BLM. The City has developed a master plan for the landfill which provides for expansion of the landfill and maintaining buffer areas.

The Carson City Sanitary Landfill has an estimated remaining capacity of approximately 19,400,000 cubic yards with the ability to expand beyond that if necessary on adjacent lands.

Projected annual tonnages for 2010 disposed of at the landfill are as follows:

Year	Waste Type	Annual Tonnage
2010	Municipal Solid Waste – From Carson City	55,000 Tons
	Municipal Solid Waste – From Other Counties	14,000 Tons
	Construction & Demolition Waste	75,000 Tons
	Total	144,000 Tons

Using an annual growth rate of two percent, the following annual tonnages can be expected based on the current waste stream.

2015	158,000 Tons
2020	174,000 Tons
2030	213,000 Tons
2040	259,000 Tons

The life expectancy of the expanded Carson City Sanitary Landfill based on current disposal practices, the calculated air space, the projected annual tonnages received, and an average density of 1.05 Tons/CY is approximately 50 years at a minimum and realistically can be managed to more than 100 years.

The Carson City Landfill is currently operated as an unlined facility without leachate or landfill gas collection, the least expensive type of landfill operation process in the U.S. When the landfill is expanded, it will need to be constructed with these additional features. This will result in significant cost increases associated with the development and operation of the landfill. Expansion of the landfill is a number of years away depending on how the landfill is managed. At present, the landfill operation and development costs are approximately $1,800,000 per year. The rates charged for waste disposal at the landfill are approximately $2,600,000 per year, resulting in an annual contribution to the general fund of approximately $800,000 per year. It is anticipated that the annual costs associated with the improved landfill will likely be increased by 25%-35%, requiring increases in the charges for waste disposal. The additional charges would be required to cover the additional operation and development costs including a geo-membrane lined landfill and the contribution to the general fund, if it is to be maintained.

As indicated above, the facility accepts about 144,000 tons per year or 450 tons of solid waste and recyclable material per day. The City's waste stream diversion rate of recyclable/reusable materials is approximately 29% which exceeds the State's current goal (not a requirement currently) of 25%. Included in the 450 ton per day estimate is approximately 44 tons per day of waste from out-of-county.

In Carson City, the curbside collection of trash, garbage and recyclables is accomplished by an exclusive franchise agreement with Capital Sanitation, a subsidiary of Waste Management Incorporated (WMI). The franchise agreement with Carson City began July 1, 1999 and extends until July 1, 2014. Upon expiration of the 15 year period, WMI has the right to extend the term of the franchise for an additional 5 year period by written notice to the City at least one year prior to the termination of the primary term.

Originally, the cost of the curbside recycling program was $1.00 per month. However, that cost has since been imbedded in the monthly garbage service fees. The base residential rate is currently $39.27 per quarter. Rates at the landfill gate are $21/ton for in-county and $50/ton for out-of-county.

To date, Carson City has not chosen to mandate garbage or recycling services. Therefore, historically the community has had an approximate 62% participation rate (14,880 households) in curbside service. Of those participants, approximately 60% (8,928 households) take advantage of the curbside recycling program. The remaining households haul their garbage to the landfill. Recycling bins are provided at the landfill for those who do not recycle at the curb and for out-of-county patrons. Additional recycling is accomplished at the landfill with a program of separating wood waste, tires, scrap metal, waste oil, anti-freeze and vehicle batteries. This program accounts for an annual diversion of approximately 10%, with the curbside recycling program and commercial efforts rounding out the overall 29% diversion rate discussed previously.

Diversion rates in California are required and currently set at 50% of the waste stream. California is considering increasing the rate to 75%. There are a number of Nevada BDR's (legislative bill draft requests) for the next legislature to increase Nevada's diversion rates and make them mandatory. EPA is also reviewing the possibility of mandatory waste diversion for landfills and increases in recycling. The future of landfills as we know them today is certain to change in the near future and will result in reduction in what is just buried and disposed of. This effort is driven by the need for new energy sources and to reduce mankind's carbon footprint on the world's resources.

Impetus for Material Recovery Evaluation

Carson City staff initiated a Request for Proposal process at the urging of the Governor and the Mayor. They had been contacted by several firms indicating an interest in demonstrating waste recovery and waste to energy technologies. As indicated above there is significant interest by State legislators in this issue and a number of legislative bills are expected to be introduced in the 2011 Legislature relating on this issue.

The Governor's office has been able to reserve $36 million in private activity bond funds for a regional waste recovery facility. This funding is similar to private industrial development bonds the City has experienced in the past. The bonds allow for private, low-interest bonding for a company to fund the capital needed for facilities as a part of the project. The City/State sponsors the project, but the bonds are repaid privately by the company and do not obligate the City or State for repayment and do not affect City or State bonding capacity.

In addition, staff has reached out to our neighbors in Douglas County, South Lake Tahoe, South Washoe County, and Lyon County. Both Douglas and South Lake Tahoe have expressed an interest in looking at a regional recovery facility. Douglas County, from the Town of Minden, currently delivers some waste to the City's landfill. Washoe County contacted the City some time ago about allowing south Washoe County residents to utilize the City's landfill, but at local City rates. Lyon County recently issued a franchise to WMI so they have not expressed an interest to date.

Douglas County has a transfer station in the Carson Valley which is nearing capacity and Douglas rates are quite high. Staff has had discussions with both Douglas staff and Douglas Disposal and there is serious interest in pursuing a regional facility if it can result in improving their situation.

Discussion with South Tahoe Refuse in relation to South Lake Tahoe also indicated interest as well. Their situation is significantly different in that their issues revolve around increasing diversion rates as required by the State of California.

Waste Management Options

The City is faced with a series of possible options. The need to go down the path of waste recovery is not yet required, but staff believes it will be in the future and the Board must decide whether to proceed now or take a wait and see approach.

One opportunity at hand is the possibility of working regionally to share costs and thus creating possible savings for each entity. In addition, if we look regionally, there is the possibility of also increasing revenues to the general fund. This will likely require a change in our ordinance to reduce the out of county rates in order to attract the additional waste stream, but revenues would be more than off set by the increased volume.

If the City moves forward with waste recovery and with increasing diversion rates, the life of the City's landfill will also increase and will allow the City to increase the waste stream, including our regional neighbors, without negatively impacting our landfill life span.

Staff anticipates that the process for waste recovery would be a phased approach – likely starting with the construction and demolition waste stream for separation and recycling, and possibly a composting operation. Future waste recovery could include a municipal waste stream recovery processing facility (MRF) for increasing recycling and diversion, landfill gas collection and conversion to energy use, and other possible waste to energy processes.

Staff conducted an extensive process for possible selection of a company to develop a waste recovery facility (see attached evaluation report). The process resulted in staff recommending that Recology, located in San Francisco and operating in many communities including in Nevada, be selected for operation of a waste recovery facility and operation of the City landfill. Recology has extensive experience with waste recovery and landfill operations in communities of our size. They bring significant expertise to varied waste management issues and have the potential to become a great partner with the City for dealing with future waste management issues.

Applicable Statute, Code, Policy, Rule or Regulation: NA

Fiscal Impact: Not determined yet.

Explanation of Impact: Revenues to the general fund could be increased if additional waste streams are gained from opening up the landfill to our regional neighbors. Costs for waste recovery will increase City costs but if shared with the region the increased costs could be mitigated to some degree to City residents.

Funding Source: Landfill Gate Revenues

Alternatives: Not proceed with contract negotiations and with further investigation at this time.

Supporting Material: RFP Evaluation Report

Prepared By: Andrew Burnham, Public Works Director

Reviewed By: ____________________ Date: 6/22/10
(Public Works)
____________________ Date: 6/22/10
(City Manager)
____________________ Date: 6/22/10
(District Attorney)
____________________ Date: 6/22/10
(Finance Director)

Board Action Taken:

Motion: ____________________ 1) ____________ Aye/Nay
2) ____________ ________
____
____
____
____

____
(Vote Recorded By)

EVALUATION REPORT

May 26, 2010

For SOQs and Proposals Received in Response to RFQ # 0910-122

CARSON CITY MATERIAL RECOVERY AND WASTE-TO-ENERGY FACILITY

BACKGROUND

On December 16, 2009, Carson City published a Request for Proposal and Statement of Qualifications (RFP/RFQ) for the development and operation of a material recovery and waste-to-energy facility for processing the City's solid waste.

The RFP/RFQ established the following minimum Performance Criteria/Components for the facility:

- 70% diversion rate of waste by 2015 utilizing a Material Recovery Facility (recyclables)
- Organics to energy facility
- Secure 100 years of sustainable processing and disposal capacity for the landfill
- Include an educational center
- Self-sustaining
- Costs to include operation, closure and post closure of landfill
- Provide income stream to General Fund
- Minimize facility's environmental impacts

The RFP/RFQ established requirements for the facility concept to be described in each company's submittal. The description requirements included:

- The development of a facility to provide an income stream from the operation of the facility for the General Fund of Carson City.
- Land and other infrastructure requirements.
- Type and amount of City waste requested.
- Estimated capital and operating cost of the program or project.
- Marketable products produced and their values.
- Proposed financing method(s), including possible grants.
- Estimated gate fees and structure.
- Preferred structure of public-private partnership with the City.
- Contractor's preference regarding the inclusion or exclusion of Douglas County's or other entities waste and its likely impact on the project.
- Percentage of waste diverted from landfill.
- Percentage of waste reused and/or recycled.
- Estimated characteristics of residual waste stream to be landfilled.
- Amount of clean, renewable energy or fuel generated (per ton of waste).
- Life-cycle greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions (per ton of waste) compared to landfilling as a baseline, itemized by reuse, recycling, energy production, landfill gas capture, and source reduction activities (as appropriate).
- Facility energy balance/budget.

- Facility water balance/budget.
- Potential adverse environmental impacts and mitigation measures (noise, air quality, traffic, etc.).

A development schedule was required to be presented in the response to the RFQ/RFP. The schedule was to include all major milestone activities and the following:

- Completion of site specific preliminary design
- Completion of the environmental review process
- Receipt of all major permits and entitlements
- Financing and possible grant availability
- Final design
- Construction
- Facility Startup
- Phasing Plan

A description of the qualifications of the firm responding to the RFP/RFQ was required that included the following:

- Staff Qualifications
- Company Qualifications
- Any other companies with "significant substantive responsibilities"
- Company Description
    - Year Formed
    - Where incorporated
    - Number of years in the field
    - List of pertinent services
- References

SUBMITTALS RECEIVED

Eight responses to the RFP/RFQ were received by February 24th. The companies submitting were:

- Applied Soil Water Technologies, LLC of Sparks, Nevada
- Carlton Engineering, Inc. of Shingle Springs, California
- Comprehensive Resources, Recovery & Reuse, Inc. (CR3) of Reno, Nevada
- Kamehameha Environmental, LLC of Carson City, Nevada
- Mustang Renewable Power Ventures, LLC of San Luis Obispo, California
- Recology Waste Zero, Inc. of San Francisco, California
- Waste Management of Nevada, Inc. of Reno, Nevada
- Zero Waste Energy, LLC of San Jose, California

SUBMITTAL REVIEW

An initial review of the submittals was conducted by a team of Carson City and consultant staff. None of the submittals responded completely to all information requested by the RFQ. Some of the submittals that were clearly non responsive or did not submit sufficient information, and therefore, did not warrant any further consideration. The other submittals were partially responsive, but additional information was needed to provide a common basis for comparison. The responses were segregated into the following categories based on the degree of responsiveness to the RFP/RFQ:

I. Non Responsive (Recognized in Submittal) – Not Considered Further

- Carlton Engineering , Inc. of Shingle Springs, California
- Waste Management of Nevada, Inc. of Reno, Nevada

Both submittals indicated explicitly in their letter of transmittal that the information submitted was not responsive to the RFQ.

II. Non Responsive (Insufficient information) – Not Considered Further

- Comprehensive Resources, Recovery & Reuse, Inc. (CR3) of Reno, Nevada
- Kamehameha Environmental, LLC of Carson City, Nevada

Neither submittal included sufficient information as requested in the RFQ for a meaningful comparison to the other submittals. For example, neither submittal included a financial analysis, estimate of revenue to the City, or manpower requirements.

III. Partially Responsive but Insufficient Revenue for City – Not Considered Further

- Applied Soil Water Technologies, LLC of Sparks, Nevada
- Mustang Renewable Power Ventures, LLC of San Luis Obispo, California

Both submittals provided much of the information requested in the RFQ, but did not indicate that the basic requirement of providing revenue for the City could be met. Both submittals also proposed projects with much higher capital cost estimates than the other responders. Mustang Renewable Power Ventures indicated less than $2 per ton of revenue to the City while the project capital cost was estimated at $115.5 million. Applied Soil Water Technologies indicated no revenue to the City while the project capital cost was estimated at $50 million to $59 million. In addition, Applied Water Technologies failed to submit a financial analysis.

IV. Partially Responsive (Revenue indicated to City) – Considered Further

- Recology Waste Zero, Inc. of San Francisco, California
- Zero Waste Energy, LLC of San Jose, California

Both submittals provided much of the information requested in the RFQ and indicated that revenue would be provided to the City.

The two proposed differed in several respects, including the amount of future municipal and C&D waste loads to be processed, the taking-over of the existing landfill operations and the type of waste-to-energy facilities to be constructed and how the facilities were to be phased. The Recology proposal was based on handling 177,000 tons of waste per year by 2015 to size facilities and estimate costs. The Recology approach included a first phase with building a construction and demolition waste processing facility, a "dirty" MRF and a compost facility, all of which would achieve a MSW diversion rate of 70% by 2015. The second phase included landfill gas recovery for power generation to potentially reduce costs. Project costs were estimated to be $35-39 per ton, including a per ton fee to the Carson City general fund.

The Zero Waste proposal was based on 140,000 tons per year to size the facilities and estimate costs and Zero Waste taking over the existing landfill operations in the first phase. The second phase consisted of building a construction and demolition waste processing facility. Phase 3 consisted of adding a waste-to-energy facility, a composting operation and a MRF facility. It was unclear whether the 70% diversion goal would be achieved by the end of phase 2; the goal would be exceeded when phase 3 was constructed. Project costs for facilities constructed through phase 2 were estimated to be $42-46 per ton and would increase to $65-70 per ton when phase 3 facilities were operational. All costs included a per ton revenue to the Carson City general fund.

The differences in annual waste loads and waste processing facilities proposed by the two companies made comparison of their proposal difficult. In addition, the proposed waste-to-energy components differed: Recology proposed a landfill gas collection and recovery system while Zero Waste proposed an anaerobic digestion process to generate biogas from organic material separated from the waste stream. While the capital cost of the landfill gas collection and recovery system was not provided in the Recology proposal, the facility was predicted to generate revenues of about $3 per ton of waste processed. The capital costs for the anaerobic digestion process proposed by Zero Waste were included in the phase 3 costs of about $25 million. The additional cost (or revenue) per ton was not provided specifically for the anaerobic digestion process. Additional information was needed to further evaluate and compare the two proposals.

SUBSEQUENT EVALUATION PROCESS

Once Recology and Zero Waste were identified as the best candidates to consider further by Carson City, additional evaluations were undertaken, including site visits to facilities owned and operated by each company, requesting additional information on their proposed approaches and interviews by the selection committee. Site visits were undertaken to see the existing facilities and current operation practices at both companies. The additional information was requested to allow each company to refine its proposal using a common basis as defined by Carson City, including waste tonnages and handling processes to be evaluated. The interviews served to provide an opportunity for the companies to discuss their proposals and for the interview panel to request clarification on the proposals and to gain a sense of each company's ability and willingness to work with Carson City through a phased and negotiated process to achieve the desired waste diversion goals at least costs to Carson City residents.

Site Visits

The selection committee visited waste management facilities in the San Francisco Bay area owned and operated by Zero Waste and Recology. The site visit to the Zero Waste facilities was on September 25, 2009, before the project selection process began, and included a MRF in San Jose and a landfill and material separation and recovery facility. The Recology facilities site visit took place on March 25 and 26, 2010 and included a MRF and transfer station in San Francisco, a composting operation and landfill in Vacaville and a demonstration project to enhance methane gas production in digesters using food scraps at the East Bay Municipal Utility District wastewater treatment plant in Oakland.

Supplemental Information

The submittals received from Recology Waste Zero, Inc and from Zero Waste Energy, LLC contained enough information to conclude that they may meet the requirements established by Carson City for their proposed facilities. Additional information was requested in the next step of the evaluation process to confirm that both proposals could meet Carson City's requirements and to evaluate the two concepts on a common basis.

The City developed a common set of scenarios for each firm to review and provide additional information. Three scenarios were developed with assumed waste stream annual tonnages from Carson City, Douglas County, and Lake Tahoe as provided in Table 1. For each scenario the City asked each firm to provide a summary outline of its current proposal including: the number of full time employees, annual operating and capital costs for operating the landfill, a material recovery facility, and a composting facility. The additional information requested by Carson City excluded the waste to energy elements as their incremental costs for construction and operations were much higher than the costs for other waste management activities.

The additional information was to be based on the following key assumptions:

- Landfill operations will be by the Contractor
- No source separation of MSW by Carson City
- Contract with the City will be for a duration of 20 years
- All fixed facilities will become the City's property after 20 years
- All financing will be provided by the Contractor
- Revenue per ton will be provided to Carson City

Table 1 - Scenarios to Evaluate for Supplemental Information

Scenarios

A	Carson City
B	Carson City and Douglas County
C	Carson City, Douglas County, and Lake Tahoe

Annual Tonnage Assumptions

Carson City Waste	
MSW annual tonnage	70,000
C&D annual tonnage	80,000
Douglas County Transfer Station	
MSW annual tonnage	30,000
C&D annual tonnage	10,000
Lake Tahoe	
MSW annual tonnage	50,000
C&D annual tonnage	40,000

Total Tonnage by Scenario	A	B	C
MSW annual tonnage	70,000	100,000	150,000
C&D annual tonnage	80,000	90,000	130,000
Total	150,000	190,000	280,000

The supplemental information provided by Recology and Zero Waste is summarized in Table 2. It is apparent that there are two significant differences in the information: the capital cost submitted by Recology and the operating costs submitted by Zero Waste. The capital cost submitted by Recology includes the cost for a "dirty" MRF as part of a total capital cost estimate ranging from $14 million to $18.5 million for the "dirty" MRF and a C&D processing facility. The capital cost provided by Zero Waste includes a material recovery facility consisting mainly of bulk materials sorting observed at the Zero Waste landfill serving San Jose and not a complete MRF designed for recovery and recycling of municipal solid waste. It was unclear why the operating costs provided by Zero Waste are much higher than the Recology operating costs, particularly when the number of employees is much higher for the Recology proposal for all scenarios.

The total costs for each scenario shown in Table 2 exclude the per ton fee for the Carson City general fund. Thus, the fee would be added to the total costs and would result in revised total costs charged for solid waste disposal operations ranging from $28.68 per ton to $37.52 per ton, depending on the waste tonnage scenario. These costs would increase if actual recovery sales are less than the assumed recovery allowance of $9 per ton.

It became apparent that additional clarification of the supplemental materials and discussion of the proposals were needed during the interviews with both companies.

Table 2 - Carson City Waste Recovery Facility Evaluation

	Scenario A 150,000		Scenario B 190,000		Scenario C 280,000	
	ZeroWaste	**Recology**	**ZeroWaste**	**Recology**	**ZeroWaste**	**Recology**
FTE's	27	40	33	56	41	73
Operating Costs	$4,878,000	$2,625,000	$5,865,000	$3,385,000	$6,986,000	$5,330,000
Capital Costs	$7,135,000	$21,500,000	$7,490,000	$23,000,000	$7,720,000	$26,000,000
Tonnage Costs						
Operating Costs	$30.14	$17.50	$28.90	$17.82	$23.57	$19.04
Capital Costs	$2.38	$7.17	$1.97	$6.05	$1.38	$4.64
Recovery Allowance	-$9	-$9	-$9	-$9	-$9	-$9
Total	$23.52	$15.67	$21.87	$14.87	$15.95	$14.68

Interviews

Interviews of the two firms were held May 12th and 13th. The interview panel consisted of the selection committee comprised of staff and the city's consultants and representatives from NDEP and Douglas Disposal/South Tahoe Refuse. The interviews provided an opportunity for each firm to provide more background on their company, describe their qualifications and experience as it relates to Carson City's project requirements and to specifically address questions from the selection committee about the original proposals and the supplemental material provided to the City. A standard set of questions was developed by the selection committee prior to the interviews that were addressed by each firm during their interview.

The standard questions asked during the interviews included the following topics:

- Negotiation process to assure competitive costs as the project is developed
- Similarities in operating in Northern Nevada with other systems
- Performance criteria, penalties, incentives based on performance
- Compliance with regulatory requirements, site monitoring
- Access by general public for waste disposal
- Company efforts to enhance the Carson City community
- Company financial stability, opportunities for financing the project

Major points emphasized by the companies during the interviews were as follows:

Recology

- Need to characterize waste stream better to refine facilities needs and costs
- They don't need to operate the landfill but that would be their preference
- Use recovered C&D and MRF fine material as daily cover at the landfill
- Company is employee owned with no one person having more than 1% of the ownership. The company does approximately $550 million a year in revenues.
- The phased approach, at a minimum, should be to conduct the waste recovery study, build and operate the C&D and composting facilities and generate fines for landfill cover.
- Performance criteria can be enforced by the use of bonds, penalties and incentives.

- Participation in the Carson City community is important, including an education center, compost give-away events, participation in community events and hiring locally.

- They emphasized their willingness to work with Carson City to obtain the result that the City desires. They stated that the relationship should be a working relationship that is open with frequent communications and weekly meetings.

Zero Waste

- The preparation of a Master Plan is critical to better define project facilities sizes and costs.

- Their preference is to operate the landfill to better coordinate the use of labor, equipment and materials with other operations at the landfill.

- The company does approximately $50 million a year in revenues.

- Performance criteria can be enforced using bonds and penalties, but the performance measures must be measurable and reasonable.

- They also believed in giving back to the community through participation in civic events and by encouraging their employees to get involved in community activities.

- They suggested that a third party be involved in the negotiation process with the City to evaluate the "fairness" of their costs and to assure competitive prices are negotiated.

As a result of the interviews, the selection committee recommended that negotiations continue with Recology for the following reasons:

- More detailed and thorough cost evaluations

- Significantly more experience working with other similar communities

- Implementation phasing plan was more flexible with lower estimated costs

- More extensive community involvement and outreach program

- Emphasized partnering with the City and other interested entities to develop a cost effective phased implementation plan

Overall staff believed the cost of working with Recology would be less and Recology clearly had more experience working with communities similar to Carson City.