

Metro TS Configuration Project
 MODA Scoring of Criteria Against Alternatives

	Scores (1-5 Scale)					
	Weight	Status Quo	Operator Choice	Geog. Equity	Reg. Light	Reg. Heavy
1. Protect people's health						
Self-haul	100	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Household Hazardous Waste	30	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Commercial Food	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Residential Food/Yard	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Operating Hours	20	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Sustainability Operational Standards	10	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.5
Flow	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Economics and Pricing	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Average		3.0	3.0	3.4	3.4	3.4
Weighted Average		3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
2. Protect the environment						
a. Life cycle GHGs						
Self-haul	10	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.5
Household Hazardous Waste	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Commercial Food	100	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	3.5
Residential Food/Yard	82	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.0
Operating Hours	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Sustainability Operational Standards	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Flow	20	3.0	2.5	4.0	3.5	4.0
Economics and Pricing	0	3.0	2.5	4.0	3.5	4.0
Average		3.0	2.9	3.5	3.3	3.4
Weighted Average		3.0	3.0	3.8	3.3	3.4
b. Toxics						
Self-haul	10	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.5
Household Hazardous Waste	100	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Commercial Food	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Residential Food/Yard	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Operating Hours	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Sustainability Operational Standards	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Flow	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Economics and Pricing	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Average		3.0	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.2
Weighted Average		3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

	Rationale				
	Status Quo	Operator Choice	Geog. Equity	Reg. Light	Reg. Heavy
illegal dumping doesn't currently appear to be a significant problem.	same as status quo	may reduce road side dumping in poorly served regions	may reduce road side dumping in poorly served regions	may reduce road side dumping in poorly served regions	may reduce road side dumping in poorly served regions
no change, HHW managed ok	same as status quo	may reduce road side dumping and exposure to workers and general public in poorly served regions but no certainty	may reduce road side dumping and exposure to workers and general public in poorly served regions but no certainty	may reduce road side dumping and exposure to workers and general public in poorly served regions but no certainty	may reduce road side dumping and exposure to workers and general public in poorly served regions but no certainty
no changes	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
no changes	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
no changes	same as status quo	may have slight improvement	may have slight improvement	may have slight improvement	may have slight improvement
no changes	same as status quo	very slight improvement	very slight improvement	very slight improvement	very slight improvement
No noticeable change in health risks likely from number, location, flow, or economics and pricing					
no change in GHG this option	same as status quo	adding more facilities will reduce GHGs slightly	adding more facilities will reduce GHGs slightly	adding more facilities will reduce GHGs slightly	adding more facilities will reduce GHGs slightly
no change in GHG this option	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
no change in GHG this option	same as status quo	ban removes more food from landfill and better placed facilities may reduce transportation GHGs	ban increases capture, but the likely candidates for selecting to receive comm food are the same as the ones already receiving so small change	ban increases capture, but transpiration goes up some	ban increases capture, but transpiration goes up some
no change in GHG this option	same as status quo	no ban, better placed facilities may reduce GHGs	no ban, the likely candidates for selecting to receive resi food are the same as the ones already receiving so no change	same as reg light	same as reg light
no change in GHG this option	same as status quo	no change in GHG this option	no change in GHG this option	no change in GHG this option	no change in GHG this option
no change in GHG this option	same as status quo	no change in GHG this option	no change in GHG this option	no change in GHG this option	no change in GHG this option
High-level estimate. Will be refined based on Metro flow model analysis.					
no change	same as status quo	less illegal dumping with better access to facilities, slight improvement	less illegal dumping with better access to facilities, slight improvement	less illegal dumping with better access to facilities, slight improvement	less illegal dumping with better access to facilities, slight improvement
no change	same as status quo	less illegal dumping and less HHW mixed with MSW with better access to facilities	less illegal dumping and less HHW mixed with MSW with better access to facilities	less illegal dumping and less HHW mixed with MSW with better access to facilities	less illegal dumping and less HHW mixed with MSW with better access to facilities
no change	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
no change	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
no change	same as status quo	no change	no change	no change	no change
no change	same as status quo	no change	no change	no change	no change
No noticeable change in toxic releases based on the number, location, flow, or economics and pricing.					

Metro TS Configuration Project
 MODA Scoring of Criteria Against Alternatives

	Scores (1-5 Scale)						Rationale				
	Weight	Status Quo	Operator Choice	Geog. Equity	Reg. Light	Reg. Heavy	Status Quo	Operator Choice	Geog. Equity	Reg. Light	Reg. Heavy
c. Nuisances											
Self-haul	100	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	no change, see comment on criteria	same as status quo	might increase nuisance in areas not currently exposed to self-haul traffic and if facilities forced to add, it may create a nuisance onsite		might increase nuisance in areas not currently exposed to self-haul traffic and if facilities forced to add, it may create a nuisance onsite
Household Hazardous Waste	30	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	no change	same as status quo	might increase nuisance in areas not currently exposed to HHW traffic and if facilities forced to add, it may create a nuisance onsite	might increase nuisance in areas not currently exposed to HHW traffic and if facilities forced to add, it may create a nuisance onsite	might increase nuisance in areas not currently exposed to HHW traffic and if facilities forced to add, it may create a nuisance onsite
Commercial Food	25	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	no change	same as status quo	commercial food has more nuisances, will increase to odor and vectors	commercial food has more nuisances, the likely candidates for selecting to receive comm food are the same as the ones already receiving so some increase due to quantity from ban	commercial food has more nuisances, the likely candidates for selecting to receive comm food are the same as the ones already receiving so some increase due to quantity from ban
Residential Food/Yard	25	3.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	no change	same as status quo	might increase nuisance in areas not currently exposed to resi food/yard traffic and if facilities forced to add, it may create a nuisance onsite due to odor and vectors	not much impact	not much impact
Operating Hours	10	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	no change	same as status quo	may have slight increase in nuisance compared to traffic today	may have slight increase in nuisance compared to traffic today	may have slight increase in nuisance compared to traffic today
Sustainability Operational Standards	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	no change	same as status quo	no change	no change	no change
Flow	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	No noticeable change in nuisances based on the number, location, flow, or economics and pricing. All alternatives use Status Quo option to determine number and location of stations: thus, not too many new facilities likely to appear. Requirements governing nuisances are independent of these alternatives.				
Economics and Pricing	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0					
Average		3.0	3.0	2.1	2.5	2.5					
Weighted Average		3.0	3.0	1.7	2.1	2.1					
d. Non-industrial land use											
Self-haul	100	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	no change	same as status quo	no new facilities just adding service	no new facilities just adding service	no new facilities just adding service
Household Hazardous Waste	100	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	no change	same as status quo	no new facilities just adding service	no new facilities just adding service	no new facilities just adding service
Commercial Food	100	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	no change	same as status quo	no new facilities just adding service	no new facilities just adding service	no new facilities just adding service
Residential Food/Yard	100	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	no change	same as status quo	no new facilities just adding service	no new facilities just adding service	no new facilities just adding service
Operating Hours	100	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	no change	same as status quo	no change	no change	no change
Sustainability Operational Standards	100	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	no change	same as status quo	no change	no change	no change
Flow	0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	No noticeable change in nuisances based on the number, location, flow, or economics and pricing. All alternatives use Status Quo option to determine number and location of stations: thus, not too many new facilities likely to appear. Requirements governing siting are independent of these alternatives.				
Economics and Pricing	0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0					
Average		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0					
Weighted Average		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0					

MODA Scoring of Criteria Against Alternatives

	Scores (1-5 Scale)						Rationale				
	Weight	Status Quo	Operator Choice	Geog. Equity	Reg. Light	Reg. Heavy	Status Quo	Operator Choice	Geog. Equity	Reg. Light	Reg. Heavy
3. Recognize prior and future public and private investment											
a. Stranded investment											
Self-haul	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	no change	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
Household Hazardous Waste	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	no change	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
Commercial Food	50	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	no change	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	Metro will control flow, free up stations for other MSW
Residential Food/Yard	20	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	no change	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
Operating Hours	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	no change	same as status quo	no change	no change	no change
Sustainability Operational Standards	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	no change	same as status quo	no change	no change	no change
Flow	100	4.5	2.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	Not likely to experience wide swings in wet waste to facilities	In the long-term, flow to Metro facilities could change substantially, particularly if there are no restrictions on where TS operators may send waste for disposal. Some private operators could lose flow as well (some winners, some losers).	Use model output.	Use model output.	Use model output.
Economics and Pricing	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	Not particularly relevant for this criterion.				
Average		3.2	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.3					
Weighted Average		3.9	2.4	3.6	3.6	3.9					
b. Potential future investment environment											
Self-haul	100	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	Same as current system	same as status quo	Requiring services of private facilities, will make them less willing to invest in the future	Requiring services of private facilities, will make them less willing to invest in the future	Requiring services of private facilities, will make them less willing to invest in the future
Household Hazardous Waste	50	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	Same as current system	same as status quo	Requiring services of private facilities, will make them less willing to invest in the future	Requiring services of private facilities, will make them less willing to invest in the future	Requiring services of private facilities, will make them less willing to invest in the future
Commercial Food	20	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	Same as current system	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
Residential Food/Yard	10	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	Same as current system	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
Operating Hours	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	not much impact	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
Sustainability Operational Standards	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	not much impact	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
Flow	80	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.5	Same as current system	Private station owners would have somewhat greater ability to direct flow to facilities. There would also be more value in purchasing franchises from smaller haulers. Much would depend on the extent of any restriction on sending waste to landfills owned by transfer station owners; however, uncertainty about flows would make Metro less likely to invest.	Same as Regulation Light	Slightly better than status quo because there would be specific criteria used to direct flow rather than current method that is somewhat more uncertain.	Same as Regulation-Light

MODA Scoring of Criteria Against Alternatives

	Scores (1-5 Scale)						Rationale				
	Weight	Status Quo	Operator Choice	Geog. Equity	Reg. Light	Reg. Heavy	Status Quo	Operator Choice	Geog. Equity	Reg. Light	Reg. Heavy
Economics and Pricing	100	3.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	Same as current system	Providing subsidies for Public Benefits would increase profits that could support additional investment by private station owners.	Same as Regulation Light	Auditing and making costs available to local jurisdictions could limit profits and could constrain the availability of funds for investment by private station owners	Regulated tip fees would limit profits and could constrain the availability of funds for investment by private station owners
Average		3.0	3.1	2.7	2.7	2.6					
Weighted Average		3.0	3.3	2.4	2.4	2.2					
4. Ensure adequate and reliable services are available to all customers											
a. Sizing											
Self-haul	100	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	some limitations (local jurisdiction and/or Metro franchise)	same as status quo	assumes capacity versus demand would be factored into what locations selected	assumes capacity versus demand would be factored into what locations selected	since all required to pick 1 of 3, might end up with all selecting self-haul and increase financial risk
Household Hazardous Waste	50	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	some limitations (local jurisdiction and/or Metro franchise)	same as status quo	assumes capacity versus demand would be factored into what locations selected	not much impact	since all required to pick 1 of 3, might end up with all selecting HHW and increase financial risk
Commercial Food	50	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	some limitations (local jurisdiction and/or Metro franchise) but not sound financial conditions	same as status quo	assumes capacity versus demand would be factored into what locations selected.	not much impact	not much impact
Residential Food/Yard	50	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	some limitations (local jurisdiction and/or Metro franchise) but not sound financial conditions	same as status quo	assumes capacity versus demand would be factored into what locations selected.	not much impact	not much impact
Operating Hours	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	not much impact	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
Sustainability Operational Standards	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	not much impact	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
Flow	100	3.0	1.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	Same as current system	Substantial risk to Metro's ability to maintain flow	Somewhat worse than today because transfer station flows would be driven by VMT and cost rather than current caps where all private stations (except one) have the same cap	Same as geographic equity	Same as geographic equity
Economics and Pricing	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	Economics and pricing not likely to affect sizing beyond what's already scored for flow				
Average		3.0	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.6					
Weighted Average		3.0	2.6	2.9	2.9	2.3					

Metro TS Configuration Project
 MODA Scoring of Criteria Against Alternatives

	Scores (1-5 Scale)						Rationale				
	Weight	Status Quo	Operator Choice	Geog. Equity	Reg. Light	Reg. Heavy	Status Quo	Operator Choice	Geog. Equity	Reg. Light	Reg. Heavy
b. Essential Services											
Self-haul	100	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	MCC and MSS currently providing service, but no specific defined pathway	same as status quo	self-haul is expensive and requires additional labor and may negatively impact other services	self-haul is expensive and requires additional labor and may negatively impact other services	self-haul is expensive and requires additional labor and may negatively impact other services
Household Hazardous Waste	20	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	MCC and MSS currently providing service, but no specific defined pathway	same as status quo	HHW is expensive and requires additional labor and may negatively impact other services	not much impact	HHW is expensive and requires additional labor and may negatively impact other services
Commercial Food	25	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	current providers but not clear path	same as status quo	provides more certainty of whose doing what service, not as cost prohibitive to add comm food	likely same participants, no flow guarantee	Metro sole provider, clear path for service
Residential Food/Yard	25	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	current providers but not clear path	same as status quo	provides more certainty of whose doing what service, not as cost prohibitive to add resi food	likely same participants, no flow guarantee	same as reg. light
Operating Hours	50	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	not much impact	same as status quo	may improve slightly	may improve slightly	may improve slightly
Sustainability Operational Standards	20	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	not much impact	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
Flow	50	3.0	1.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	Same as current system	Some chance that providing desired services would be less likely in this model because fewer tons to Metro and some mechanism would need to be developed to compensate private station owners for providing services they may not be that interested in providing	Not highly influence by method that tons flow to facilities	Not highly influence by method that tons flow to facilities	Not highly influence by method that tons flow to facilities
Economics and Pricing	100	3.0	4.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	Same as current system	Metro subsidizing essential services that are not economic for all station operators would be a good way to ensure those services are provided	No substantial impact on the ability to provide essential services	Same as geographic equity	Same as geographic equity
Average		3.0	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.1					
Weighted Average		3.0	3.2	2.9	2.9	2.9					

Metro TS Configuration Project
MODA Scoring of Criteria Against Alternatives

	Scores (1-5 Scale)						Rationale				
	Weight	Status Quo	Operator Choice	Geog. Equity	Reg. Light	Reg. Heavy	Status Quo	Operator Choice	Geog. Equity	Reg. Light	Reg. Heavy
c. Access Equity											
Self-haul	100	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.5	no change	same as status quo	assumes selected facilities would be chosen to meet this criteria	improves with more providers	going to have improvement but doesn't guarantee who picks
Household Hazardous Waste	70	1.0	1.0	1.5	1.5	2.0	no change	same as status quo	will see some improvement but not for all areas because likely only one facility added	providing at least annual access for entire region	going to have improvement but doesn't guarantee who picks
Commercial Food	20	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.5	1.0	no change	same as status quo	assumes selected facilities would be chosen to meet this criteria and has chance of bigger impact	may be few providers than now	only two locations
Residential Food/Yard	20	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.5	1.5	no change	same as status quo	assumes selected facilities would be chosen to meet this criteria and has chance of bigger impact	may be few providers than now	may be few providers than now
Operating Hours	50	1.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	no change	same as status quo	some improvement with more equal hours	some improvement with more equal hours	some improvement with more equal hours
Sustainability Operational Standards	0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	no change	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
Flow	40	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.5	2.0	No substantive change in access equity	No substantive change in access equity	Might be slight improvement in access equity for commercial collection vehicles: no change for self-	Same as Geographic Equity	Same as Geographic Equity
Economics and Pricing	0										
Average		1.0	1.0	1.9	1.7	1.7					
Weighted Average		1.0	1.0	2.1	1.9	1.9					
5. Maintain our commitment to the solid waste hierarchy as set forth in state law											
Self-haul	0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	no additional action	same as status quo	no additional RRR, just increased opportunity to disposal, unless Metro requiring to also add reuse and recycling along with this service	no additional RRR, just increased opportunity to disposal, unless Metro requiring to also add reuse and recycling along with this service	no additional RRR, just increased opportunity to disposal, unless Metro requiring to also add reuse and recycling along with this service
Household Hazardous Waste	0	1.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	1.0	no additional action	same as status quo	could increase opportunity for reuse of materials (cleaning products) if there is a material exchange	will provide more reuse options to larger group	no additional RRR, just increased opportunity to disposal, unless Metro requiring to also add reuse and recycling along with this service
Commercial Food	100	1.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	no additional action	same as status quo	ban increases	ban increases	ban increases
Residential Food/Yard	50	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	no additional action	same as status quo	no resi ban, potentially reduced hauler transportation cost and that passed to generator, so more participation	not much impact	same as reg. light
Operating Hours	0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	no additional action	same as status quo	no additional action	no additional action	no additional action
Sustainability Operational Standards	0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	no additional action	same as status quo	no additional action	no additional action	no additional action
Flow	50	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	No specific action taken, yet the system does have the capability to assist in achieving per-capita reductions in disposal	This model may result in more wet waste at private stations, and less space to manage other materials. More room at Metro stations: overall probably a slight reduction in capability to effect change	Same as Status Quo	Same as Status Quo	Same as Status Quo
Economics and Pricing	0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0					
Average		1.0	1.0	1.5	1.6	1.4					
Weighted Average		1.0	1.0	2.3	2.3	2.3					

MODA Scoring of Criteria Against Alternatives

	Scores (1-5 Scale)						Rationale				
	Weight	Status Quo	Operator Choice	Geog. Equity	Reg. Light	Reg. Heavy	Status Quo	Operator Choice	Geog. Equity	Reg. Light	Reg. Heavy
6. Maintain a system that is flexible and adaptable to changing needs and circumstances											
Self-haul	20	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	same as status quo	same as status quo	by requiring certain facilities to provide this service, it takes away some of their flexibility to provide other services	by requiring certain facilities to provide this service, it takes away some of their flexibility to provide other services	by requiring certain facilities to provide this service, it takes away some of their flexibility to provide other services
Household Hazardous Waste	10	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	same as status quo	same as status quo	taking up a space and equipment commitment for this service	more options	by requiring certain facilities to provide this service, it takes away some of their flexibility to provide other services
Commercial Food	50	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	facilities that can make it work are doing it	same as status quo	provides selected facilities and non-selected more clarity on what they can do with their space	facilities that can make it work are doing it	A little less flexible than today because only 2 stations to take it to
Residential Food/Yard	50	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	facilities that can make it work are doing it	same as status quo	provides selected facilities and non-selected more clarity on what they can do with their space	facilities that can make it work are doing it	same as reg. light
Operating Hours	50	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	not very flexible, see criteria comments	same as status quo	requiring private facilities to be open more, may reduce ability to do new services	requiring private facilities to be open more, may reduce ability to do new services	requiring private facilities to be open more, may reduce ability to do new services
Sustainability Operational Standards	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	not very flexible, see criteria comments	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
Flow	100	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	Service flexibility would be similar to today's system	Same as Status Quo	Same as Status Quo	Same as Status Quo	Same as Status Quo
Economics and Pricing Average		3.0	3.0	2.6	2.6	2.5					
Weighted Average		3.0	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.5					
7. Sustainable finance											
a. Fair public funding											
Self-haul	20	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	no change, self-haul a small piece of the system	same as status quo	additional costs of self-haul could increase reg system fee	additional costs of self-haul could increase reg system fee	everyone required to provide an expensive service
Household Hazardous Waste	10	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	1.0	no change	same as status quo	additional costs of HHW could increase reg system fee	not much impact	everyone required to provide an expensive service
Commercial Food	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	no change	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
Residential Food/Yard	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	no change	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	same as reg. light
Operating Hours	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	no change	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
Sustainability Operational Standards	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	no change	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
Flow	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	no change	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	not much impact
Economics and Pricing	100	3.0	2.0	3.5	3.5	4.0	No change from current system	With limited local government review of private station tip fees, this option could result in an increase in operator profits by funding Public Benefits through the Regional System Fee, particularly if more wet waste flows to private facilities	Same as Regulation - Light	Making costs transparent to local government will ensure that private transfer station profits to not become unreasonably high	Regulating rates will ensure that private transfer station profits to not become unreasonably high
Average		3.0	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.6					
Weighted Average		3.0	2.2	3.2	3.2	3.3					

Metro TS Configuration Project

MODA Scoring of Criteria Against Alternatives

	Scores (1-5 Scale)						Rationale				
	Weight	Status Quo	Operator Choice	Geog. Equity	Reg. Light	Reg. Heavy	Status Quo	Operator Choice	Geog. Equity	Reg. Light	Reg. Heavy
b. Full cost pricing											
Self-haul	20	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	no change, self-haul a small piece of the system	same as status quo	additional costs of self-haul could increase tip fees		everyone required to provide an expensive service
Household Hazardous Waste	20	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	1.0	no change	same as status quo	additional costs of HHW could increase tip fees	limited impact but will increase slightly	everyone required to provide an expensive service
Commercial Food	5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	no change	same as status quo	some additional cost but no guaranteed flow, not much overall change	not much impact	not much impact
Residential Food/Yard	5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	no change	same as status quo	not much impact	not much impact	same as reg. light
Operating Hours	20	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	no change	same as status quo	limited impact but will increase slightly	limited impact but will increase slightly	limited impact but will increase slightly
Sustainability Operational Standards	5	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	no change	same as status quo	limited impact but will increase slightly	limited impact but will increase slightly	limited impact but will increase slightly
Flow	0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0					
Economics and Pricing	100	3.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	No change from current system	With limited local government review of private station tip fees, this option could result in an increase in operator profits by funding Public Benefits through the Regional System Fee, particularly if more wet waste flows to private facilities	Same as Regulation - Light	Making costs transparent to local government will ensure that private transfer station profits are reasonable	Rate regulation would results in similar profit margins at all privately-owned transfer stations
Average		3.0	2.9	2.6	2.8	2.5					
Weighted Average		3.0	2.4	3.2	3.3	3.5					
8. Minimize long-term life cycle cost of providing transfer services											
Self-haul	20	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	no change	same as status quo	slightly more expensive	slightly more expensive	everyone required to provide an expensive service that will need changes
Household Hazardous Waste	20	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	1.0	no change	same as status quo	more expensive	not expected to change from current	everyone required to provide an expensive service that will need changes
Commercial Food	5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	no change	same as status quo	some additional fee but tip fee should be separate and not impact overall tip fee	not expected to change from current	only at two locations, less cost
Residential Food/Yard	5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	no change	same as status quo	similar to today	not expected to change from current	same as reg. light
Operating Hours	20	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	no change	same as status quo	similar to today	similar to today	similar to today
Sustainability Operational Standards	5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	no change	same as status quo	similar to today	similar to today	similar to today
Flow	0	3.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	4.0					
Economics and Pricing	100	3.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	4.0					
Average		3.0	2.8	3.0	3.1	2.9					
Weighted Average		3.0	2.4	3.3	3.5	3.1					