

- Economic Flow Control (Assessments on users to reduce tipping fee)
 - Advantages
 - Easy to administer assessments
 - Can serve as basis for bonds
 - Provides a reliable source of revenue
 - Could charge non-assessed users full fee (discouraging out of area waste – if this is undesired)
 - Makes funding ancillary services (HHW, transfer stations, outreach, etc.) easier and more equitable
 - Since ancillary services are already funded via assessments it would encourage their use vs. a user charge
 - Disadvantages
 - May be politically unpopular
 - Does not provide incentives to reduce volume of waste (flat fees)
 - Equity issue
 - Lower waste generators subsidize larger waste generators
 - This likely occurs more on the residential side
 - May not work as well for potential revenue producing waste streams (i.e. recyclables, yard waste, etc.) – haulers may still take to their own facilities to generate revenue
 - Does not guarantee all waste delivered to facility
 - Where is waste coming from? Out of area? Requires enforcement
- Regulatory Flow Control (ordinances/contractual requirements to deliver waste)
 - Advantages
 - Guarantees all waste directed to facilities
 - Can serve for basis for revenue bonds
 - Provides reliable source of revenue
 - Can provide for higher than market tipping fees to cover ancillary services
 - This would encourage use of ancillary services
 - More equitable cost of service (higher per capita generating cities would pay full cost)
 - Provides monetary incentive for volume reduction (to reduce disposal cost, must reduce amount disposed)
 - Works well across all waste streams
 - Disadvantages
 - Less predictable revenue stream
 - If ancillary services not funded with tipping fees, would create disincentive for their use (residential) and disproportionately impact municipalities that are not near waste facilities
 - Would require enforcement mechanisms which would place additional costs on the system
 - More likely to face legal challenges