



CITY OF SACRAMENTO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

Melvin H. Johnson
Director
Leslie M. Frink
Deputy Director
Reginald Young
Deputy Director

January 3, 1986

Transportation and Community Development Committee
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members In Session:

SUBJECT: City Solid Waste Disposal Program - Quarterly Status Report

SUMMARY

The following report summarizes the past three months of the City Solid Waste Disposal Program.

BACKGROUND

The City is continuing the number of parallel activities to phase out operations for disposal at the 28th Street Landfill and to implement a midterm and long term solution for disposal of solid waste collected by the Solid Waste Division and generated by other City departments. The results of the first phase of solid waste disposal planning were presented to the Transportation and Community Development Committee at its meeting of October 14, 1985. The Department of Public Works is implementing the recommendations of that report. Activities regarding the operation, design, and eventual closure of the 28th Street Landfill are continuing. The Transportation and Community Development Committee has requested a quarterly status report on Solid Waste Disposal Operations and Planning Activities. The current status of major components is as follows:

1. Landfill Alternative Study and Granite Quarry EIR

At its October 14, 1985 meeting the Transportation and Community Development Committee was presented with findings and recommendations regarding this subject.

The Landfill sites evaluated within the City of Sacramento are generally unsuitable for use as a conventional landfill. This is based on potential land use conflicts, high cost of meeting environmental protection and traffic impacts. The Granite Gravel Quarry was evaluated extensively and was rejected due to potential ground water quality protection problems. Ground water was found within five feet of the bottom of the mined out areas of the quarry. Provisions to protect ground water quality would be prohibitively expensive to implement.

Hauling wastes directly to existing landfills located in Yolo County and Sacramento County was confirmed to be expensive. A transfer station, with disposal at a remote landfill appears to be the most feasible option for the interim period (next five to ten years). This option will allow flexibility to implement waste-to-energy or other waste processing options when feasibility allows.

A detailed economic and siting evaluation is currently underway to compare the three major transfer station options to be considered:

1. City owned/operated transfer station;
2. Privately owned/operated transfer station;
3. Expansion of the two county transfer stations

A report outlining the results of this evaluation and presenting recommendations should be completed in late spring or early summer, 1986.

2. Solid Waste Disposal Options RFP

A request for proposal (RFP) for Solid Waste Disposal Options was prepared and distributed in late July, 1985. Seven responses were received containing sufficient detail to be responsive to the RFP. Four proposals for transfer stations, one for a co-composting facility, one for a waste pelletizing project and one for a vegetal waste project were received. At its meeting of October 29, 1985, City Council directed Public Works Department staff to compare public and private transfer station ownership/operation. If the private sector option proves to be the preferred option, then the proposals received by staff for transfer stations would be used as a basis for contract negotiation. Staff was also directed to consider potential contract terms and conditions with Organic By-Products, Inc. for an expanded vegetal waste facility if existing contract provisions with the State can be satisfactorily resolved. California Co-Compost Systems, Inc. was given a six month time period to prepare a more specific contract proposal for evaluation.

The transfer station evaluation is underway and recommendation regarding the costs/benefits of a privately owned transfer station operation will be presented to City Council during the late spring/early summer. Consideration of implementation of the expanded vegetal waste process is held in abeyance during the discussions/negotiations with the State regarding the existing contract. There have been no direct contacts with staff by California Co-Compost, Inc., since the presentation made by that firm at the City Council meeting of October 29, 1985. However, Public Works staff is aware that CCSI is actively working with Sacramento County to obtain an agreement with the County.

3. Waste-to-Energy Feasibility

At the City Council meeting of October 29, 1985, City Council directed staff to discontinue further activities regarding feasibility of waste-to-energy unless difficulties in obtaining air emission permits can be resolved, and energy contracts are more attractive. Brown-Vence and Associates meanwhile has submitted a final copy of a draft Request for Proposal for waste-to-energy. This document will allow the City to issue an RFP on short notice when conditions improve for waste-to-energy.

4. 28th Street Landfill

- A. The City expects to receive comments from the Regional Water Quality Control Board on the Closure Plan before the end of this month. City staff informally met with Regional Board staff in early December and was assured that the draft plan which has been submitted substantially meets the requirements of the Regional Board. The Regional Board will be requesting that the older portion of the Landfill be closed and sealed with a clay cap as early as possible. This is consistent with the closure plan as proposed by the City. As specific areas receive enough waste to reach final grade, a clay cap will be immediately installed.
- B. The City has finished moving 66,000 cubic yards of clay soil from the Pocket area to the Landfill. This material will provide about half of the Landfill's clay requirement for final cover.

- C. The Landfill Gas Recovery Request for Proposal has been issued in November. A bidders conference was held December 19, 1985. Several landfill gas recovery companies have indicated their intent to submit proposals. Proposals must be submitted by February 13, 1986. An evaluation committee will be convened to review the proposals and interview the leading candidates.
- D. The landscaping contract for the landfill has been signed and a significant portion of the required work completed

FINANCIAL

There are no direct financial impacts in this report. The Public Works Department intends to continue using the consultant team of Jones and Stokes/Cooper Engineers to conduct evaluations for Solid Waste Disposal Alternatives. This contract has been budgeted and approved by City Council.

RECOMMENDATION

This report is submitted for the Committee's information. If the Committee so desires, this report will be forwarded to the Council for its information.

Respectfully submitted,

Approved for Committee Information:

Solon Wisham Jr.
SOLON WISHAM, JR.
Assistant City Manager

JFB:eh
JB514Td5

for Reginald Perry
JOHN F. BOSS
Supervising Engineer
Planning and Special Projects

Approved:

Melvin H. Johnson
MELVIN H. JOHNSON
Director of Public Works

January 14, 1986
All Districts