

Screening and Evaluation Criteria

Criteria Development

In order to assist Sonoma County (County) in solving their short- and long-term solid waste management objectives, a strategy was developed to screen and evaluate a list of potential alternatives. The initial step in this process was to develop and define criteria to evaluate alternative waste management scenarios. After discussion with County staff, it was determined to utilize those criteria identified and approved as part of the Solid Waste Management Alternatives Analysis Project in December 2000 as a starting point for criteria development. These were developed and approved by the Local Task Force (LTF) and County staff. The original list of criteria in the 2000 Alternatives Study included:

- Operating History
- Siting Element Exclusionary Standards
- Wastestream Applicability
- Relevance to Solid Waste Management System
- Consistency with AB 939 Waste Management Hierarchy
- Distribution of Economic Benefits and Impacts
- Environmental Consequences
- Role of Public Sector Entities
- Regulatory Liability and Exposure
- Disposal Needs and Obligations
- Capital Costs
- Operating Costs
- Cost per Ton
- Siting, Design, Permitting and Construction Requirements
- Ownership/Operation Responsibilities
- Environmental Impacts

Using this list of criteria and understanding the County's current solid waste management system's constraints and changed conditions since 2000, twelve screening and evaluation criteria were developed. These criteria are listed and defined for alternative evaluation purposes below.

- **Operating History** – What has been the alternative's track record in terms of performance, including the term of operation for handling a waste stream of the size and type of the County's? How reliable has the alternative historically been in



Screening and Evaluation Criteria

handling waste? Has it been used as a normal industry standard for handling waste? Is the alternative safe?

- **Diversion Potential & Consistency with AB 939 Waste Management Hierarchy** – What is the diversion potential of the alternative? What have been the historic levels of diversion achieved for a typical waste stream and the types of materials diverted? How is this alternative consistent with the State’s AB 939 Waste Management Hierarchy? Does the alternative contribute to educating the public about diverting waste? Does the alternative have potential impact on the long-term viability of working towards a zero waste goal? Does the alternative use the highest and best use of materials in diversion processes?
 - **Distribution of Economic Benefits and Impacts, and Social Equity** – What are the potential economic benefits and impacts of the alternative? These impacts could include the potential for creating and maintaining employment or growth opportunities for residents, businesses and industries within the County. Does the alternative improve social equity ?
 - **Environmental Consequences** – What are the potential negative environmental impacts associated with development or implementation of the alternative? What are the potential mitigation measures? What are the positive environmental benefits from implementing an alternative? Does the alternative generate environmental justice issues?
 - **Role of Public Sector Entities & JPA Participation Potential** – Does the alternative maintain the authority of the County, the jurisdictions, the Sonoma County Waste Management Agency (referred to as JPA), other similar non-regulatory public institutions, political units or governmental bodies in managing the County’s solid waste system? Is there potential for the alternative to affect participation by the JPA and its members?
 - **Regulatory Cooperation** – What are the potential regulatory risks and exposure from implementation of the alternative? What are the financial, legal or potential policy impacts and can they can be managed or controlled? Does the alternative provide potential opportunities for regulatory cooperation?
 - **Disposal Needs and Obligations** – What are the disposal requirements of the alternative? Does the alternative reduce the need for disposal? Will the alternative assist the County in meeting its disposal capacity needs? Is the disposal alternative within the County? What level of disposal capacity does the alternative provide? Are there capacity risks associated with the alternative?
 - **Capital Costs** – What is the capital cost of the alternative? Describe the capital components of the alternative and the range of costs attributable to the alternative. What is the operating life of these capital components? Is financing available for these capital components?
-

Screening and Evaluation Criteria

- **Operating Cost** – What is the operating cost for the alternative? Describe the operating cost components of the alternative and the range of costs attributable to the alternative. Are there options available to reduce the operating cost?
- **Cost per ton** – What is the overall cost per ton for the alternative? This includes amortized capital costs, annual operating costs, and netting out of projected revenues (if applicable). The net annual cost is then divided by the estimated number of tons handled by the alternative.
- **Siting, Design, Permitting and Construction Requirements (reflecting time and cost necessary to implement alternative)** – What are the necessary steps to develop and implement the alternative including any required siting, design, permitting and special construction related requirements? What are the time requirements and costs necessary to implement the alternative?
- **Effect on Current System Costs** – How will implementing the alternative impact the current system costs? Will system costs increase or decrease?



Screening and Evaluation Criteria

Scoring and Weighting

In the next phase of this Project each of the alternatives will be analyzed in detail and evaluated according to the criteria listed above. Each of the alternatives will receive a score from 1 to 5 for each criterion, depending on how consistent they are with the goals and objectives of the County. The scores will be issued as follows:

- Score of 5 – Exceeds County’s Goals & Objectives
- Score of 4 – Partially Exceeds County’s Goals & Objectives
- Score of 3 – Meets County’s Goals & Objectives
- Score of 2 – Meets Some County’s Goals & Objectives
- Score of 1 – Does Not Meet County’s Goals & Objectives

In addition, each of the criteria will receive a weight. The weights will be multiplied by the scores received from each criteria and summed by alternative (i.e. there will be 12 weighted and scored criteria summed for each alternative). Proposed weights based on 100 points of total weighting are shown below:

Criteria	Weight (pts)
Operating History	6
Diversion Potential/Consistency with AB 939 Hierarchy	14
Distribution of Economic Benefits and Impacts, and Social Equity	6
Environmental Consequences	10
Role of Public Sector Entities & JPA Participation Potential	7
Regulatory Cooperation	7
Disposal Needs and Obligations	9
Capital Costs	6
Operating Cost	7
Cost per ton	9
Siting, Design, Permitting and Construction Requirements	9
Effect on Current System Costs	10
Totals	100