

Committee Members

- County Staff
- Business Owners
- Members from our Solid Waste Advisory Committee
- Members from RIPP (Residents Involved in Positive Planning)
- Cities and CSD's
- Douglas County, NV

Volume 1 Executive Summary

Overall Plan in nine sections – 38 pages

- Background
- Discussion
- Goals
- Objectives
- Strategies by Objective
- Strategies by Phase (Near, Intermediate and Long term)
- Strategy Cost Comparison
- Cost Assessment of Major Infrastructure
- Implementation Approach

Volume II-Detailed Strategies and Support

- Background Data
- Detailed Strategy Descriptions (42 strategies)
- Supporting Materials
- In-depth analysis of facility placement
- 195 pages

Action Plan

- Recommendations of the Committee and County Staff
- Developed because Volumes I & II were overwhelming
- 10 pages
- Broke out Infrastructure and Program Strategies
- Based Recommendations on Tons diverted per \$1000 spent

Recommendations

- Formation of a West Slope JPA
- Program Strategies mandated by regulation
- Program and Infrastructure Strategies with cost effectiveness of at least 10 tons per \$1000 spent

Program Strategy Rankings

Table 1 - Program Strategy Rankings

Rank	Strategy	Number and Name	Estimated One-Time Costs	Estimated Recurring Annual Costs	Tons Diverted per \$1,000 Spent ^a	Diversion Increase
1		nter Pay-As-You-Throw Pricing Programs	\$25,000 - \$40,000	Minimal	231	0.2%
2	2.5 Enhance Ordinan	and Enforce C&D ce	\$5,000 - \$10,000	\$5,000 - \$10,000	61	0.1%
3	2.3 Expand I Practices	Purchasing Preference	\$5,000 - \$7,500	\$2,000	57	0.0%
4		Mandatory Residential on Ordinance	\$35,000 - \$50,000	\$250,000 - \$500,000	36	3.1%
5		nt Residential Food Waste on Program	\$15,000 - \$35,000	\$100,000 - \$300,000	28	1.3%
6	2.13 Enhance Programs	Home Composting	\$25,000 - \$50,000	\$10,000 - \$20,000	19	0.1%
7		Jse of Curbside g Programs	\$35,000 - \$50,000	\$250,000 - \$750,000	13	1.6%
8		ent Mandatory rcial Recycling Program	\$35,000 - \$50,000	\$100,000 - \$300,000	13	0.6%
9		nt New Waste Reduction Commercial Facility Waste	Minimal	\$15,000 - \$30,000	13	0.1%
10	and Com	Existing School, Park, munity Facility g Programs	\$25,000 - \$50,000	\$5,000 - \$10,000	11	0.0%
11		e Multi-Family g Program	\$15,000 - \$20,000	\$75,000 - \$200,000	7	0.2%
12		ent Commercial Food ollection Program	\$15,000 - \$35,000	\$200,000 - \$300,000	6	0.3%
	Total		\$235,000 - \$397,500	\$1,012,000 - \$2,422,000		7.5%

Note: Mandatory program strategies are shown in bold.

^a Based on average annual costs (the sum of one-time costs amortized over ten years plus recurring annual costs).

Infrastructure Strategies

Table 2 - Infrastructure Strategies

Rank	Strategy Number and Name	Estimated One- Time Costs	Estimated Recurring Annual Costs	Tons Diverted per \$1,000 Spent ^a	Percent Diversion
West	Slope MRF/Transfer Station Options				
1	3.10 Implement a Modern West Slope MRF/Transfer Station	\$10,000,000 – \$15,000,000	\$200,000 - \$400,000	13	2.9%
2	1.3 Extend Use of and Modify WERS as Needed	\$1,000,000 - \$4,000,000	\$0 - \$250,000	10	0.9%
3	3.2 Implement a West Slope Eco Park	\$24,000,000 – \$39,000,000	\$500,000 - \$1,000,000	8	6.9%
Other	r New West Slope Facility Options			•	
1	3.9 Implement a West Slope C&D Processing Facility	\$2,000,000 - \$4,000,000	\$200,000 - \$350,000	17	2.3%
2	3.4 Implement a County Composting Facility	\$2,000,000 - \$4,000,000	\$200,000 - \$300,000	14	1.7%
3	3.5 Implement Small Volume Rural Transfer Stations and Strategically Place Debris Boxes on West Slope	\$750,000 – \$1,500,000	\$150,000 – \$300,000	Unknown	Minor Diversio Greater Convenience Reduced Illeg Dumping
South	h Lake Tahoe MR/F/Transfer Station Op	otion			
1	3.8 Upgrade SLT MRF and Transfer Station for Single Stream	\$2,000,000 - \$5,000,000	_	6	0.5%
	Total				5.4% to 12.3%
Unio	n Mine Landfill Option				
1	3.3 Re-open Union Mine Landfill (May be combined with other strategies: compost, MRF)	\$43,000,000 – \$126,000,000 ^b	Potential Savings		May Enhance Other Strategies

^a Based on average annual costs (the sum of one-time costs amortized over ten years plus recurring annual costs). ^bThese costs would be amortized over the new useful life of the landfill which could be as long as 29 years.

Supporting Strategies

Do not directly increase diversion, but support other strategies

Table 3 - Supporting Strategies

	Estimated	Estimated	
Strategy Number and Name	One-Time Costs	Recurring Annual Costs	
1.1 Create West Slope JPA	\$10,000 - \$50,000	\$150,000	
1.2 Conduct County Waste Characterization Studies	\$150,000		
1.5 Create Regional JPA	\$10,000 - \$50,000	-	
2.11 Expand Types of Recyclables Collected Curbside	\$5,000 - \$10,000	\$10,000 - \$20,000	
2.14 Prepare for Possible Elimination of Residential Yard Waste Burning on West Slope	\$15,000 - \$25,000	\$5,000 - \$10,000	
2.15 Develop Community Composting Programs	\$15,000 - \$20,000	\$5,000 - \$10,000	
2.17 Advance Outreach and Education Programs	-	\$15,000 - \$20,000	
2.7 Use Residential Three-Cart System (Contributes to Diversion for 2.6)	-	—	
2.9 Expand Diversion Programs at Public Facilities	\$5,000 - \$10,000	\$5,000	
Total	\$210,000 - \$315,000	\$190,000 - \$215,000	

Conclusion

- 45 day Comment Period
- Posted on County Website for download
- Copies available for review at County Libraries
 and Environmental Management Department
- Questions and Comments will be posted on the County Website
- Plan will be revised incorporating comments
- Final Plan early 2012
- Plan will be implemented by EMD and EDSWAC

Questions and Comments

The Draft Plan is available at: <u>www.edcgov.us/emd/solidwaste/swmplan.aspx</u>

Email Questions and Comments to: edcswmp@edcgov.us