Katherine Douglas

Public Comment





From: Corydon Mathews <cmathews@sbcdsa.org>

Sent: Monday, June 26, 2023 11:53 AM

To: sbcob

Cc: Supervisor Das Williams; Lavagnino, Steve; Laura Capps; Hartmann, Joan; Bob Nelson;

Neil Gowing

Subject: A-76 - Proposed Franchise Agreement

Attachments: No. 2 Letter to BOS re- Solid Waste Hauler[68].pdf

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Clerk of the Board:

Please see the attached letter from the DSA for the Board's consideration on item A-76, setting a hearing for the Approval of the Exclusive Franchise Agreement for Solid Waste Collection in Zone 4 & Zone 5.

Thank you,

Corydon Mathews

Executive Director



Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and then delete all copies of the original message.

June 26, 2023

Attn: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors

I am writing to express my concern about the Santa Barbara Board of Supervisors' (BOS) decision to changes the rules and reduce competition for the County waste hauling contract.

In May 2023, the BOS took a significant step by passing an amendment to Chapter 17, which mandated that a minimum of two waste haulers serve the County's unincorporated areas. Avoiding a waste disposal monopoly is essential, as a monopoly does not benefit the community. Multiple haulers facilitate a competitive and practical waste management system in the County. Considering the importance of this matter to County residents, we must ask why it wasn't addressed prior to initiating the Request for Proposal (RFP) process.

Changing policy after the process is terrible policy for several reasons:

- 1. Lack of fairness: The RFP process is designed to ensure fairness and transparency in the procurement process. By changing policy after the RFP process, you are undermining the fairness of the process. Bidders may have invested significant time, effort, and resources in preparing their proposals based on the initial policy. Changing the policy afterward, as it appears the County is planning on doing, has led to an unfair advantage for Marborg Industries and a disadvantage to WM, compromising the integrity of the procurement process.
- 2. **Reduced competition**: Changing policy after the RFP process limits the number of qualified bidders from participating. Bidders may be less inclined to bid on a project if they perceive that policies can change arbitrarily, making it difficult to assess risks and align their proposals accordingly. Reduced competition leads to less favorable outcomes in terms of quality, pricing, and innovation.
- 3. Loss of trust and credibility: Changing policy after the RFP process erodes trust and credibility, both within the procurement process and among potential bidders. Bidders expect stability and consistency in the policy framework to make informed decisions. When policies are changed unexpectedly, it creates an impression of unpredictability and unprofessionalism, damaging the reputation of the procuring organization and discouraging future participation.

Marborg rates are consistently higher in neighboring zones and municipalities that rely on antiquated vehicles and processes. For example, the City of Santa Maria terminated its partnership with Marborg in 2022 for processing single-stream recyclables collected by the city. The proposed rates experienced a significant increase compared to previous terms, leading to the non-renewal of the agreement. Consequently, the city had no choice but to initiate a new RFP process. Neighboring jurisdictions are experiencing significant rate spikes attributed to organics compliance, state law changes and inflation. WM rates have remained stable despite these factors while successfully achieving compliance goals.



- Effective July 2023, Lompoc will witness a substantial 15.6% increase.
- Effective April 2023, Los Osos will observe an extraordinary 97.61% increase.
- Effective April 2023, Cambria will experience a notable 41.46% increase.
- Effective January 2023, SLO City will encounter a modest 17.75% increase.

I urge the esteemed members of the Board of Supervisors to reconsider their decision with thoughtful deliberation and an open mind. The implications of your choice are far-reaching, impacting not only residents throughout the County but organizations such as our own. By revisiting the matter and considering the perspectives shared by the concerned citizens, you can demonstrate responsive and responsible governance. Let us embrace the power of unity and collaboration to arrive at a decision that reflects our community's true needs.

Sincerely,

Neil Gowing, President

Santa Barbara County Deputy Sheriffs' Association