

ATTACHMENT B

SUMMARY OF LONG-TERM SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

Long Term Option	Base Operation and Disposal \$/ton¹	Central Environmental, Closure and Post-Closure Maintenance \$/ton	Closed Landfill Maintenance \$/ton	JPA Fee \$/ton	Total Projected Tip Fee \$/ton	Pros	Cons
Divestiture	\$89.75	Included in Base Operation and Disposal Cost (Current 30-year closure and post-closure estimate= \$40-\$50 million)	\$6.10	\$5.40	\$101.25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Landfill would re-open for in-county disposal • Central, Sonoma and Annapolis are divested and Healdsburg and Guerneville are under long-term lease • Proposer takes all risk for Central Landfill unless it is related to an off-site release of contaminants resulting in a claim filed in the first 10 years of the agreement. • Significant funds (\$2.7 million/year) available to County to address (i) potential off-site claims at Central in first ten years, plus (ii) post-closure costs of closed landfill sites • After ten years potential for no further liability for the Central Landfill • Rates stabilized for 20 years • MRF to be built by proposer at the landfill will result in significant increase in diversion • Decreased GHG emissions from in-county disposal • Under the current proposal if the Central Landfill cannot be re-permitted, Proposer provides out-haul and disposal for 2-3 years until County issues a new contract • If for any reason the Central Landfill becomes unavailable after closing, the proposer is required to take County and City committed waste to one of their other landfills in the Bay Area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires 20 year flow commitment from County and all cities, if all cities don't sign up, may be possible to save deal but with higher rates. • If there is an off-site claim within the first 10 years, County and Cities retain some residual liability for off-site claims • Residual risks are incrementally increased by continued expansion and disposal of waste at Central Landfill • If permits for in-county landfill not achieved there is no divestiture and no transfer of liabilities • Increased county waste diversion and per capita generation rate reductions, could result in tip rate increases • Proposer has requested a put or pay if refuse generation drops below 70% of the 2007 generation rates. • County employees displaced

¹ Assumes 100% system tonnage including Petaluma

ATTACHMENT B

SUMMARY OF LONG-TERM SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

Long Term Option		Base Operation and Disposal \$/ton¹	Central Environmental, Closure and Post-Closure Maintenance \$ /ton	Closed Landfill Maintenance \$/ton	JPA Fee \$/ton	Total Projected Tip Fee \$/ton	Pros	Cons
Long-term Truck Out-Haul Options	Public and Private Operation (Status Quo)	\$75.00	\$23.00 (Until Central Closure is completed, \$3.00 afterward)	\$6.10	\$5.40	\$109.50 (Until Central closure is completed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easiest to implement because it is existing system Could meet long term disposal capacity through long-term disposal agreements County maintains control of County facilities which may provide on-going means to collect funds needed to cover liabilities provided cities continue to use system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continues higher level of GHG emissions County/Cities retain all environmental liabilities for Central and other landfills, including closure and post closure maintenance If less than all cities use system, rates could increase to as much as \$118.40/ton @ 80% or \$146.40/ton @ 50% of current tonnage Rates more volatile as County must have full cost recovery and waste flow not secure and may decrease Little or no impact on diversion Regulatory Agencies will require immediate closure of Central – County may need to finance closure gap to meet regulatory deadlines
	Fully Privatized Operation	\$71.00	\$23.00 (Until Central Closure is completed, \$3.00 afterward)	\$6.10	\$5.40	\$105.50 (until Central closure is completed)	<p align="center"><i>(All pros as above apply)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely will result in lowest possible rates 	<p align="center"><i>(All cons as above apply)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> County employees are displaced
Long –Term Rail Out-Haul		\$77.00	\$23.00 (Until Central Closure is completed, \$3.00 afterward)	\$6.10	\$5.40	\$111.50 (until Central closure is completed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could meet long term disposal capacity through long-term disposal agreements County maintains control of County facilities which may provide on-going means to collect funds needed to cover liabilities provided cities continue to use system Rail haul will reduce local congestion over truck out-haul GHG impact unknown 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Freight service does not currently exist in Sonoma County Would need to extend existing out-haul contracts until infrastructure is in place County/Cities retain all environmental liabilities for Central and other landfills, including closure and post closure maintenance If less than all cities use system, rates could increase to as much as \$120.40/ton @ 80% or \$148.40/ton @ 50% of current tonnage Rates more volatile as County must have full cost recovery and waste flow not secure and may decrease Little or no impact on diversion Regulatory Agencies will require immediate closure of Central – County may need to finance closure gap to meet regulatory deadlines

ATTACHMENT B

SUMMARY OF LONG-TERM SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

Long Term Option	Base Operation and Disposal \$/ton¹	Central Environmental, Closure and Post-Closure Maintenance \$ /ton	Closed Landfill Maintenance \$/ton	JPA Fee \$/ton	Total Projected Tip Fee \$/ton	Pros	Cons
Re-Open Central Landfill	\$77.00	\$28.00	\$6.10	\$5.40	\$116.50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central re-opened for in-County Disposal • Reduced GHG emissions • Long term disposal capacity 15 years + • Time to collect funds needed for final closure • County maintains control of County facilities which may provide on-going means to collect funds needed to cover liabilities provided cities continue to use system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would need to extend existing out-haul contracts until infrastructure is in place • County /Cities retain all environmental liabilities for Central and other landfills, including closure and post closure maintenance • Closure, post-Closure and leak liability costs increase with resumption of expansion and disposal at the Central Landfill • County re-opening the Landfill results in highest disposal rates of all alternatives • If less than all cities use system rates could increase to as much as \$142.40/ton @ 80% or \$194.40/ton @ 50% of current tonnage • Would need to secure flow commitments to finance liner construction and economy may still make it difficult to get financing • Rates more volatile as County must have full cost recovery and waste flow not secure and may decrease • Due to high development cost this option is not feasible for reduced tonnage scenarios • Little or no impact on diversion

ATTACHMENT B

SUMMARY OF LONG-TERM SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

Long Term Option	Base Operation and Disposal \$/ton¹	Central Environmental, Closure and Post-Closure Maintenance \$/ton	Closed Landfill Maintenance \$/ton	JPA Fee \$/ton	Total Projected Tip Fee \$/ton	Pros	Cons
The Center for the Environment	\$100.50	\$23.00 (Until Central Closure is completed, \$3.00 afterward)	\$6.10	\$5.40	\$135.00 ≤\$15.40² \$119.60 (until Central closure is completed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to North Bay this project will increase system wide diversion approximately 5%-15% • May result in decreased GHG emissions attributed to increased diversion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no actual written proposal to the County only a verbal proposal that has changed over time; uncertain whether North Bay is willing to contractually guaranty the increased diversion targets • Would need to extend existing out-haul contracts until infrastructure is in place • County/Cities retain all environmental liabilities for Central and other landfills, including closure and post closure maintenance; the \$10.00/ton rebate is not enough to cover all liabilities • Requires flow control commitments from the County and all cities for 20 years • If less than all cities use system, rates could increase to an unknown level • Would render County system infeasible; resulting in transfer station closures and increasing GHG emissions for vehicle miles traveled hauling garbage, potentially negating any emissions benefits • Potential for rate escalation is unknown • With only one facility in the County, illegal dumping could increase <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Residual waste will be out-hauled • County employees displaced

² Assumed base rate includes \$10.00/ton rebate toward liabilities and \$5.40 for JPA based on verbal proposals by North Bay Corporation to City Managers Association Meeting in the Spring of 2009