

TABLE 4-1: SUMMARY OF OPTION COMPARISON

Option	I	I - Potential Import	II	III	IV-H	IV-SH
Scenario	Landfill -Base	Landfill - 500 TPD*	Transfer Station	CT Facility	No-Project/Haulers	No-Project/Self-haul
<b>Economics</b>						
<i>CUMULATIVE COST \$M</i>						
Year 2009 Annual Cost	\$ 2.01	\$ 0.83	\$ 2.03	\$ 6.56	\$ 2.00	\$ 5.98
40 Year	\$ 101	\$ 46	\$ 123	\$ 398	\$ 136	\$ 406
Expansion Life (2011)	\$ 316	\$ -	\$ 455	\$ 1,475	\$ 558	\$ 1,666
<i>COMPARISON TO BASE</i>						
Year 2009 Annual Cost	100%	42%	101%	327%	100%	298%
40 YR -Cumulative Cost \$M	100%	45%	122%	395%	135%	402%
Expansion Life (2011)	100%	N/A	144%	467%	177%	528%
<i>SCORING</i>						
Year 2009 (\$2005)	50	120	50	15	50	17
40 YR -Cumulative Cost \$M	50	110	41	13	37	12
Expansion Life (2011)	50	-	35	11	28	9
<b>Environmental Impacts</b>	Higher degree of leachate and LFG concerns than other Options	Higher degree of leachate and LFG concerns than other Options	Less Disturbed area and water and LFG concerns than Option I	Similar to Option II but more Air Emission Controls	Additional road traffic and resulting air impacts. Avoids GCLF site impacts.	Significant additional road traffic, air impacts, and illegal dumping impacts. Avoids GCLF site impacts
	3	2	6	5	4	1
<b>Diversion</b>	Continued drop-off at GCLF site	Continued drop-off at GCLF site	Additional tipping floor recovery with MRF expansion potential	On the order of 50% landfill diversion, but credits may to be allowed in future	Probably less diversion - but less rich loads than Self Haul	Probably less diversion
	4	3	6	5	2	1
<b>Regulatory</b>	Comprehensive permitting documents, with some additional issues for Phase A	Comprehensive permitting documents, with some additional issues for Phase A and import reporting	Less permit reporting and potential environmental permitting than Option I	More air permitting and permit reporting from CT facility than Option II	Least permitting issues	Slightly more AB 939 reporting than Option IV-H
	2	1	4	3	6	5
<b>Implementation/Uncertainties</b>	Greater regulatory compliance uncertainty, and may ultimately require MRF which would be better suited under Option II	Some additional needs and uncertainty compared to Option I regarding importation agreements and liability	Less control of landfill cost agreements; can expand diversion levels if needed better than other options	CT are not proven on mixed MSW. Costs are high with great uncertainty; diversion credit availability is uncertain	Cost impacts and air impacts are uncertain; uncertainty of cost and competition varies by each hauler	Cost impacts and air impacts are uncertain; significant illegal dumping problems
	5	4	6	1	3	2
<b>Flexibility</b>	Less initial investment than Options II, III and I-Import; less flexibility for diversion than Options II and III	Less initial investment than Options II and III; less flexibility for diversion than Options II and III	Greater initial investment than Options I and IV; more flexibility for diversion than other options	Greatest initial investment; less flexibility regarding waste steam in-feed specifications and operations	Similar to IV-Self Haul; but some haulers have disposal facilities available	Would not provide facility services and expandability; increases reliance on other parties, hence has least flexibility
	5	4	6	3	2	1
<b>Total Scores - Current Economics</b>	69	134	78	32	47	
<b>Total Scores- 40 Year</b>	69	124	69	30	38	
<b>Total Scores- Expansion Life</b>	69	14	63	28	32	

\* Cost shown is portion paid by Glenn County on Glenn County Waste Steam only.