23

CITY OF SACRAMENTO

DIVISION OF WASTE REMOVAL
927 TENTH STREET
SUITE 200
SACRAMENTO, CALIF. 95814
TELEPHONE (916) 449-5757

REGINALD YOUNG
SUPERINTENDENT
PAUL SMILANICH
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT

October 8, 1982

City Council
Sacramento, California

AG 82037

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: SMUD Waste-to-Energy Study

SUMMARY

This report informs the City Council that the City Manager has secured Sacramento County's participation in the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) Waste-to-Energy study and the City Engineer has negotiated a proposed agreement for City participation in the study. Thus this report recommends that the City Council approve the proposed Waste-to-Energy agreement and authorize the City Manager to execute the agreement with SMUD.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

On June 29, 1982 the City Council:

1. Authorized City Engineer to participate in the SMUD Waste-to-Energy Study.

2. Approved the allocation of $50,000 from the Waste Removal Fund as the City's share of the study's cost.

3. Authorized the City Manager to communicate with the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors to solicit the County's participation in the Waste-to-Energy Feasibility Study.

The County of Sacramento has agreed to participate in the proposed study (see attached Exhibit 1).

The City Engineer, SMUD, and Sacramento County's Director of Public Works have drafted a Request for Proposal (RFP) that defines the scope and effort of the study (also in Exhibit 1).

23

City Council October 8, 1982

FINANCIAL DATA

Participation in the SMUD Waste-to-Energy study requires that the City enter into an agreement and transfer $50,000 to SMUD by November 1, 1982. As previously approved by the City Council, the $50,000 would be allocated from the Waste Removal Fund.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the City Council:

1. Approve the attached Agreement to Fund a Feasibility Study for a SMUD Waste-to-Energy Project.

2. Approve the attached resolution which authorizes the City Manager to execute the agreement with SMUD.

Respectfully submitted,

Reginald Young
Waste Removal Superintendent

RECOMMENDATION APPROVED:

Walter J. Slipe
City Manager

Exhibits: (1) Agreement to Fund a Feasibility Study for a Waste-to-Energy Project

(2) Resolution Authorizing Execution of Agreement with the Sacramento Municipal Utility District

All Districts
October 19, 1982

RESOLUTION NO. 82-728

ADOPTED BY THE SACRAMENTO CITY COUNCIL ON DATE OF

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF AGREEMENT WITH
THE SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT
AND AMENDING FY 82-83 CITY WASTE REMOVAL BUDGET
$50,000.00 FOR WASTE-TO-ENERGY STUDY

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO:

1. That the City Manager is authorized to execute an agreement with the Sacramento Municipal Utility District to participate in a Waste-to-Energy feasibility study.
2. That the Fiscal Year 1982-83 City Waste Removal budget is amended in the amount of $50,000.00, 4-15-3200-5056-4258, transfer from 4-15-5072-0000-4399 Discretionary Reserve.
3. That payment of $50,000.00 is approved to Sacramento Municipal Utility District for the Waste-to-Energy Study.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK

APPROVED
BY THE CITY COUNCIL
OCT 19 1982
OFFICE OF THE
CITY CLERK

23

AGREEMENT TO FUND A FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR A WASTE-TO-ENERGY PROJECT

I. Purpose of this Agreement

The purpose of this agreement is to fund and conduct a study of the feasibility of building and operating waste-to-energy project in Sacramento County.

II. Participants

The participants in the project, and their funding responsibilities are as follows:

Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD)	50% (to a maximum of $100,000)
City of Sacramento (City)	25% (to a maximum of $50,000)
County of Sacramento (County)	25% (to a maximum of $50,000)

III. Scope of Work

The scope of work for this agreement is contained in Appendix A, entitled, "Request for Proposals" (RFP). SMUD will be the Project Manager for the study, and as such will issue the RFP to hire an experienced consultant to conduct the feasibility study. SMUD will also perform the evaluation of the responses to the RFP, and present the evaluation, along with its recommendation to the Advisory Committee. SMUD will contract with the Consultant selected by the Advisory Committee, and will direct the day-to-day work of the Consultant throughout the study.

IV. Advisory Committee

There shall be an Advisory Committee, consisting of one voting member from each of the Participants. The duties of the Advisory Committee are as follow:

1. Select the Consultant
2. Review and comment on the Draft Final Report

3. Approve the Final Report
4. Resolve any questions brought to them by the Project Manager.

The members of the Advisory Committee will be:

SMUD - Dallas G. Raasch, Manager, Generation Engineering Department

Alternate: Mark W. Anderson, Project Engineer

City - John Varrozza, City Engineer

Alternate: Reginald Young, Supt. of Waste Removal

County - William C. Wanderer, Deputy Director of Public Works

Alternate: Patrick Maxfield, Planning Engineer

All decisions made by the Advisory Committee will require the unanimous consent of all Participants.

V. Transfer of Funds

The City and County shall each transfer $50,000 to SMUD by November 1, 1982. SMUD will use these funds and its own contribution of $100,000 to pay for costs incurred in conducting the feasibility study. At the conclusion of the feasibility study, SMUD will refund to the Participants any funds remaining from the original budget of $200,000 as follow:

SMUD: 50%

City: 25%

County: 25%

After the study is concluded, SMUD's project records will be made available to the City and County upon request for the purpose of conducting an audit.

VI. Schedule

The anticipated schedule for completion of the study is:

Issue RFP asap

23

Receive Responses	11-1-82
SMUD Evaluate Responses and Recommend Selection to Advisory Committee	11-15-82
Advisory Committee Select Consultant SMUD Board Award Contract and Consultant Begin Work	12-2-82
Draft Final Report Complete	5-1-83
Final Report Complete	6-1-83

VII. Termination

This agreement may be terminated at any time by mutual agreement of the Participants. In the event of termination, the District will pay all outstanding project expenses from project funds, and refund any remaining funds to the Participants.

This agreement terminates on July 31, 1983, unless extended by mutual agreement.

APPENDIX A

Sacramento Municipal Utility District
Request for Proposal for Architect/Engineering
Consulting Services

I. Project

The Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) wishes to determine the feasibility of building and operating a refuse-fired steam power plant. This plant is to be located in the vicinity of Sacramento, California.

II. Purpose

The purpose of this Request For Proposal (RFP) is to solicit bid proposals from qualified architect-engineer firms (hereafter called contractor) to perform a study which will determine the technical, environmental, and economic feasibility of building and operating a steam power plant which uses municipal solid waste (MSW) and possibly a mixture of MSW and coal or lignite as its fuel.

Federal, State and local air quality regulations are a major constraint on the licensing of the proposed plant. The contractor will be required to carefully examine the prospects for successfully meeting the licensing and operating permit requirements of the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California Air Resources Board (ARB), the California Energy Commission (CEC) and the Sacramento County Air Pollution Control District (APCD).

The contractor will be required to examine the existing process for disposing of MSW in Sacramento City and County. A base case of the impacts of continued use of sanitary landfill for MSW disposal will be developed and compared to the proposal for burning MSW in a power plant boiler.

III. Scope of Work

The contractor shall provide qualified personnel to perform the following tasks: (In performing these tasks, the Contractor shall use, to the maximum extent possible, existing data from SMUD and the city and county of Sacramento.)

1) Confirm the quantity, composition and energy content of MSW, coal and lignite which are available locally for fueling the power plant.

2) Confirm base case of present cost of landfill and estimate future cost of landfill disposal.

3) Prepare conceptual design and estimate the capital and operating costs of the refuse-fired power plant and develop a schedule for design, construction, and start-up.

23

4) Investigate the potential for cogeneration (i.e., markets for the low-pressure steam which is a byproduct of the power plant).

5) Investigate the potential for front-end resource recovery from the MSW (i.e., markets for recycled materials and costs of reclaiming these materials).

6) Prepare a preliminary report on the environmental aspects of the proposed plant including location, purpose and need, air quality (including the type of emissions control technology which will be required and the quantity and availability of emissions trade-offs that will be needed), water quality and availability, solid waste disposal, noise, traffic, odor, pests, aesthetics, socioeconomics, health and safety, alternate resource recovery processes, transmission line availability, compatibility with local zoning regulations, public acceptance, potential for cogeneration (availability of steam users); and rank the sites studied. This study will serve as the Initial Study required by the California Environmental Quality Act.

7) Prepare a cost analysis for constructon and operation of the power plant and compare to the cost estimate for continued use of sanitary landfill for MSW disposal (from task No. 2 above).

8) Prepare a final project report.

IV. Schedule

The following schedule has been established for selection of an A-E by SMUD and completion of the study.

1)	Deadline for Submitting Proposals	11-15-82
2)	Pre-bid Conference	11-01-82
3)	Selection of Contractor	12-15-82
4)	Begin Study	01-01-83
5)	Draft Report	05-01-83
6)	Final Report	06-01-83

V. Qualifications of Contractor

The contractor should have demonstrated technical capability and experience in steam power plant design including both coal and refuse-fired plants, emission controls, ash disposal and solid waste management. The contractor should also have demonstrated experience in conducting environmental studies and with the legal, socioeconomic and environmental constraints that exist in California, with regard to siting and operating waste disposal and power generation facilities.

VI. Submittal of Proposals

Five copies of the proposals should be sent to:

Mr. D. G. Raasch
Manager, Generation Engineering
Sacramento Municipal Utility District
P.O. Box 15830
Sacramento, CA 95813

Proposals may also be hand delivered to our offices at 6201 S Street, Sacramento, CA.

All proposals must be received by the District prior to November 15, 1982.

VII. Proposal Information

Proposal shall include the following information:

A. Technical Information:

Contractor shall provide a summary list of similar projects that the contractor has worked on. Contractor shall state the work location for each item of Section III.

1) A brief statement of the origin and background of the firm.

2) Information relative to the firm's experience in steam power plant design, coal and refuse combustion processes, solid waste management, emissions control technology and environmental impact studies.

3) A demonstration of the contractor's knowledge of the applicable regulatory processes of the EPA, ARB, CEC, and APCD.

4) A list of any other consultants the firm will use.

5) A detailed resume for the project manager and lead person for each of the major task areas.

B. Cost Information:

The proposal shall include a total cost, hourly rate, and man-hour breakdown for each task, one through seven, of section III, Scope of Work. The District shall have the option of awarding any or all of the seven tasks to the contractor. The contractor shall not be paid separately for task eight regardless of the tasks contracted for.

23

VIII. Contract Terms and Conditions

Upon selection of a firm to perform the work, the District will give the contractor written notice to proceed and will forward to the contractor a formal written contract for signature. The following terms and conditions will apply to this contract.

A. Cancellation Clause:

The District reserves the right to cancel a contract with two weeks notice. In the event this contract is cancelled, the A-E will be paid on a prorated basis for any satisfactory work performed and submitted to the District.

B. Ownership of Drawings, Reports, Design Calculations or other data:

The original of all drawings, reports, design calculations and other information pertinent to the project shall be submitted to the District prior to final payment. The contractor will deliver ten copies of the final report to the District prior to final payment.

C. Terms of Payment:

The proposals should all be based on a monthly progress payment schedule for direct hours worked plus reimbursement of expenses. Invoices shall be submitted in triplicate with supporting documentation, including payroll information and reimbursable expenses such as travel, subsistence and miscellaneous services and supplies. Reimbursement of these expenses is based on their reasonableness and compliance with the contractor's corporate policies.

D. Project Budget

The District has budgeted $200,000 for this study. Proposals must have a total cost which does not exceed $200,000 in order to be considered competitive.

IX. Bid Evaluation

The primary factors used in bid evaluation will be the contractor's qualifications and the total cost to the District for the services described in the proposal.

The evaluation of the contractor's qualifications will be based on the information provided on both the firms experience and on the qualifications of the personnel available for this project. Since this factor is highly important in the evaluation, all proposals should provide complete information in this area. Failure to provide complete information as requested may result in rejection of the proposal.

Executed as of October _____, 1982

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
A Municipal Corporation

By:_____
City Manager

ATTESTED:

_____
City Clerk

SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT:

By:_____
Generation Engineer