

SINGLE HAULER CONTRACTING: Weighting Decision Making Criteria Exercise Results

Six of the seven City Council members were able to participate in an exercise to weight decision criteria for use in determining what is important in evaluating proposals for a single hauler contract for Rochester Hills.

The decision criteria weighting exercise was made up of these sub-parts:

1. Service Scope Criteria
2. Service/Cost Value Equation Criteria
3. Social/Environmental Criteria

A scoring matrix was provided for each of these areas. Each participant completed two steps: 1) after reading a specific criteria they rated it on a scale of importance with 1 being "critically important" and 5 being "not very important"; and 2) then each participant ranked all the criteria in that matrix in order of priority with 1 being the most important criteria and the last number in the ranking meaning that it's the least important criteria. Comments could be inserted as needed.

Following are the preliminary results that will be used to guide the development process as Rochester Hills considers proposals for a single hauler contract for waste, recycling and yard waste collection services.

DRAFT PROGRAM DESCRIPTION – Based on Results

The following draft program description is based on the final weighted priority list of all criteria – shown on the final page of this summary.

1. Single Hauler System for Everyone – (opt out only for long vacancies over time)
2. Hauler Handles Billing – Or City Bills w/Hauler Data
3. Saving Money for Residents is Most Important Reason
4. Reducing Trash Trucks on Roads is 2nd Most Important Reason
5. Improving Service is 3rd Most Important Reason
6. Includes Weekly Trash Pickup – question of whether to include cart
7. Includes Weekly Recycling Pickup, Single Stream – question of whether to include cart
8. Revenue Sharing to RH on Recyclables – offered by one contractor
9. Preference is for 4 Day Week System – Monday through Thursday
10. Preference is for Incentives/Convenience to Increase Recycling Rate – question of RecycleBank
11. Other Program Features Include:
 - a. Service for Interested Apartment Complexes
 - b. Service for Interested Businesses
 - c. Handicap "Back Door" Service for Eligible Residents
 - d. Storm Debris Service
 - e. Unlimited Bulky Items (or reasonable amount – e.g. 2 bulky items per week)

SERVICE SCOPE CRITERIA – Average Results

Criteria to be Evaluated	Evaluate Importance	Ranking
Weekly trash pickup is essential even if every other week service reduces cost	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 2.2 Rank 3.3
4 day/week routes (M-Th) are preferred to avoid Saturday service after holidays	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 1.8 Rank 5.3
A resident should be able to opt-out of the service when away for long periods of time	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 3.2 Rank 8.0
Subdivisions should be able to opt-out of the service if they have better deal	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 3.3 Rank 9.8
Rolling trash carts are an important feature and every resident should be given one.	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 3.7 Rank 9.2
An unlimited quantity of bulky items should be allowed even if cost is higher	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 2.8 Rank 7.2
Limiting households to 96 gallons of waste per week will motivate people to recycle	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 3.8 Rnk 10.3
Providing a 64 gallon roll cart for recycling would help residents recycle more	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 3.0 Rank 8.2
Rewarding households with financial incentives for recycling is the best solution	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 2.67 Rank 6.7
Collecting recyclables every other week should be considered to cut costs	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 3.2 Rank 8.2
Collection of storm debris is a key feature of the single hauler collection system	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 2.7 Rank 6.8
Handicap "back door" service should be part of the contractor's specifications	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 2.3 Rank 7.3
The contractor should be available to service apartments if they are interested	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 1.8 Rank 7.0
The contractor should be available to service businesses if they are interested	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 2.0 Rank 7.5

Comments

1. Service should be same or similar to what resident currently has or this proposal will go south in a hurry. Should be weekly w/recycling and limited schedule.
2. We can't consider a trash contract that limits service to 1 can/week. The question on bulk items needs clarity as virtually all people do not need unlimited bulk item pickup.

SERVICE/COST VALUE EQUATION CRITERIA–Results

In responding to the following service/cost value equation criteria – consider that a quality service for curbside refuse, recycling and yard waste will be available for around \$160 per year per household. All cost increases or savings below refer to annual costs per household.

Criteria to be Evaluated	Evaluate Importance	Ranking
Trash collection every other week should be considered if it could save \$36/year.	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 3.8 Rank 7.7
Opt out provisions should be considered even if it will increase costs \$24/year.	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 3.8 Rank 8.2
Subdivisions should be able to opt-out even if contract costs increase \$24/year	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 3.7 Rank 7,3
Rolling trash carts are important even at a cost increase of \$12/year	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 3.5 Rank 6.2
An unlimited quantity of bulky items should be allowed even if cost is \$20/year higher	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 3.2 Rank 4.5
Allowing residents 2 bulky items per week is ok if cost is only \$12/year higher	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 3.8 Rank 6.3
Limiting residents to what fits into a 96 gallon cart could save \$20/year.	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 4.0 Rank 8.2
Having the hauler do all billing is worth it even if cost is \$24/year higher	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 1.8 Rank 3.2
Using a refuse millage to cover costs is worth it if average households save \$75/Yr	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 3.5 Rank 7.8
Providing a convenient rolling cart for recyclables is worth the extra \$12/Yr.	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 3.2 Rank 6.2
Providing weekly recycling is worth the extra \$8 per year	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 2.2 Rank 3.0
Senior discounts for service are an important cost feature of the billing system	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 3.7 Rank 8.2

Comments

1. Hauler Billing is the only acceptable way to go
2. See comments on unlimited service on other page. I think direct billing is fine – will still save money, less hassle for us. Less trucks, etc. Doesn't seem like folks want a millage on it.

SOCIAL/ENVIRONMENTAL CRITERIA– Average Results

Criteria to be Evaluated	Evaluate Importance	Ranking
We should reduce the number of trash trucks running over our roads	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 1.2 Rank 3.8
Providing trash carts to each house will help our city streets “look and be” clean	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 3.3 Rank 9.3
Everyone in the City should have a convenient way to recycle	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 1.5 Rank 5.8
We should make recycling as convenient as possible	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 1.8 Rank 8.5
A single hauler contract could save residents \$100/year	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 1.5 Rank 2.3
A single hauler contract could increase the city’s recycling rate to 50%	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 1.5 Rank 6.3
Saving money and improving service are worth eliminating hauler choice	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 1.5 Rank 3.5
Better recycling and recycling incentives are worth eliminating hauler choice	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 2.0 Rank 7.0
It is important that our apartments and businesses recycle as well	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 1.8 Rank 7.2
Minimizing government role in trash and recycling service even if higher cost	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 2.8 Rank 7.0
City billing of residents for trash/recycling service to achieve higher cost savings	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 3.2 Rank 85
A refuse millage paid by all parcels in City to achieve highest cost savings.	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 3.3 Rank 8.5

Comments

1. Key for me is to reduce costs and trucks while limiting our involvement as much as possible. I also think increased recycling is good, although not main.

PRIORITY CRITERIA AREA– Average Results

Criteria Group to be Evaluated	Evaluate Importance	Ranking
Service Scope Criteria as discussed in the Service Scope Matrix	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 1.5 Rank 2.0
Service/Cost Value Equation Criteria as discussed in that Matrix	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 2.2 Rank 1.8
Social/Environmental Criteria as discussed in that Matrix.	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Critically Important----- Not Very Important	Imp. 2.0 Rank 2.2

Comments

1. Service/Cost Value – Over-riding concern is to save \$\$, Secondary benefit is less damage to roads, improved safety of our streets, increased recycling, better service, cleaner look of the city.
2. What will be the cost to service apartments?
3. What will be the cost to service businesses?
4. We have to be careful on mutually exclusive questions – e.g. senior discount will not apply to millage based services.

SINGLE HAULER CONTRACTING:

Exercise Results – Priority Within Groups

Service Scope Weighted Ranking

Weekly trash pickup is essential even if every other week service reduces cost	1	7.22
4 day/week routes (M-Th) are preferred to avoid Saturday service after holidays	2	9.78
The contractor should be available to service apartments if they are interested	3	12.83
The contractor should be available to service businesses if they are interested	4	15.00
Handicap Nback door service should be part of the contractor's specifications	5	17.11
Rewarding households with financial incentives for recycling is the best solution	6	17.78
Collection of storm debris is a key feature of the single hauler collection system	7	18.22
An unlimited quantity of bulky items should be allowed even if cost is higher	8	20.31
Providing a 64 gallon roll cart for recycling would help residents recycle more	9	24.50
A resident should be able to opt-out of the service when away for long periods of time	10	25.33
Collecting recyclables every other week should be considered to cut costs	11	25.86
Subdivisions should be able to opt-out of the service if they have better deal	12	32.78
Rolling trash carts are an important feature and every resident should be given one.	13	33.61
Limiting households to 96 gallons of waste per week will motivate people to recycle	14	39.61

Service/Cost Value Equation Weighted Ranking

Having the hauler do all billing is worth it even if cost is \$24/year higher	1	5.81
Providing weekly recycling is worth the extra \$8 per year	2	6.50
An unlimited quantity of bulky items should be allowed even if cost is \$20/year higher	3	14.25
Providing a convenient rolling cart for recyclables is worth the extra \$12/Yr.	4	19.53
Rolling trash carts are important even at a cost increase of \$12/year	5	21.58
Allowing residents 2 bulky items per week is ok if cost is only \$12/year higher	6	24.28
Subdivisions should be able to opt-out even if contract costs increase \$24/year	7	26.89
Using a refuse millage to cover costs is worth it if average households save \$75/Yr	8	27.42
Trash collection every other week should be considered if it could save \$36/year.	9	29.39
Senior discounts for service are an important cost feature of the billing system	10	29.94
Opt out provisions should be considered even if it will increase costs \$24/year.	11	31.31
Limiting residents to what fits into a 96 gallon cart could save \$20/year.	12	32.67

Social/Environmental Weighted Ranking

A single hauler contract could save residents \$100/year	1	3.50
We should reduce the number of trash trucks running over our roads	2	4.47
Saving money and improving service are worth eliminating hauler choice	3	5.25
Everyone in the City should have a convenient way to recycle	4	8.75
A single hauler contract could increase the city's recycling rate to 50%	5	9.50
It is important that our apartments and businesses recycle as well	6	13.14
Better recycling and recycling incentives are worth eliminating hauler choice	7	14.00
We should make recycling as convenient as possible	8	15.58
Minimizing government role in trash and recycling service even if higher cost	9	19.83
City billing of residents for trash/recycling service to achieve higher cost savings	10	26.92
A refuse millage paid by all parcels in City to achieve highest cost savings.	11	28.33
Providing trash carts to each house will help our city streets look and be clean	12	31.11

Criteria Group Weighted Ranking

Service Scope	1	3.00
Service-Cost Value Equation	2	3.97
Social Environmental	3	4.33

SINGLE HAULER CONTRACTING:

Exercise Results – Overall Weighted Priority

1	A single hauler contract could save residents \$100/year	15.17
2	We should reduce the number of trash trucks running over our roads	19.38
3	Weekly trash pickup is essential even if every other week service reduces cost	21.67
4	Saving money and improving service are worth eliminating hauler choice	22.75
5	Having the hauler do all billing is worth it even if cost is \$24/year higher	23.06
6	Providing weekly recycling is worth the extra \$8 per year	25.82
7	4 day/week routes (M-Th) are preferred to avoid Saturday service after holidays	29.33
8	Everyone in the City should have a convenient way to recycle	37.92
9	The contractor should be available to service apartments if they are interested	38.50
10	A single hauler contract could increase the city's recycling rate to 50%	41.17
11	The contractor should be available to service businesses if they are interested	45.00
12	Handicap Nback door service should be part of the contractor's specifications	51.33
13	Rewarding households with financial incentives for recycling is the best solution	53.33
14	Collection of storm debris is a key feature of the single hauler collection system	54.67
15	An unlimited quantity of bulky items should be allowed even if cost is \$20/year higher	56.60
16	It is important that our apartments and businesses recycle as well	56.94
17	Better recycling and recycling incentives are worth eliminating hauler choice	60.67
18	An unlimited quantity of bulky items should be allowed even if cost is higher	60.92
19	We should make recycling as convenient as possible	67.53
20	Providing a 64 gallon roll cart for recycling would help residents recycle more	73.50
21	A resident should be able to opt-out of the service when away for long periods of time	76.00
22	Providing a convenient rolling cart for recyclables is worth the extra \$12/Yr.	77.57
23	Collecting recyclables every other week should be considered to cut costs	77.58
24	Rolling trash carts are important even at a cost increase of \$12/year	85.73
25	Minimizing government role in trash and recycling service even if higher cost	85.94
26	Allowing residents 2 bulky items per week is ok if cost is only \$12/year higher	96.44
27	Subdivisions should be able to opt-out of the service if they have better deal	98.33
28	Rolling trash carts are an important feature and every resident should be given one.	100.83
29	Subdivisions should be able to opt-out even if contract costs increase \$24/year	106.81
30	Using a refuse millage to cover costs is worth it if average households save \$75/Yr	108.91
31	City billing of residents for trash/recycling service to achieve higher cost savings	116.64
32	Trash collection every other week should be considered if it could save \$36/year.	116.74
33	Limiting households to 96 gallons of waste per week will motivate people to recycle	118.83
34	Senior discounts for service are an important cost feature of the billing system	118.95
35	A refuse millage paid by all parcels in City to achieve highest cost savings.	122.78
36	Opt out provisions should be considered even if it will increase costs \$24/year.	124.35
37	Limiting residents to what fits into a 96 gallon cart could save \$20/year.	129.76
38	Providing trash carts to each house will help our city streets Nlook and be clean	134.81