

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACKNOWLEDGING	)	RESOLUTION NO. 80-204
THE EAST MULTNOMAH COUNTY SEWER	)	
CONSORTIUM STUDY AS COMPLYING WITH	)	Introduced by the Regional
THE REGIONAL WASTE TREATMENT	)	Planning Committee
MANAGEMENT PLAN	)	

WHEREAS, Metro has been designated by the Governor of the state of Oregon as the Areawide Waste Treatment Management Planning Agency for the Portland metropolitan region; and

WHEREAS, Metro has adopted a Regional Waste Treatment Management Plan by Ordinance No. 80-102; and

WHEREAS, The Regional Waste Treatment Management Plan required an investigation of the regional alternative for providing sewerage facilities in the Inverness, Troutdale, Gresham Treatment System Study Area, in accordance with Article V, section 1, (A) (2) (a) (iv) of the Regional Plan Text; and

WHEREAS, The East Multnomah County Sewer Consortium has evaluated the capital, operating and maintenance costs of the regional alternative against the independent expansion of the existing sewage treatment plants in the region; and

WHEREAS, The cost differences related to capital facilities between the two alternatives were found to be insignificant in both the East Multnomah County Sewer Consortium Study and the earlier "208" Study conducted by the Columbia Region Association of Governments (CRAG); and

WHEREAS, The independent expansion alternative was found to be superior according to the other criteria of Implementability,

Environmental Impact, Reliability, Flexibility and Energy Consumption; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the East Multnomah County Sewer Consortium Study be accepted in partial compliance (capital facilities) with the "208" Plan requirement to evaluate regional treatment alternatives for the Troutdale, Gresham, Inverness Treatment System Study Area.

2. That the Work Plan for the Consortium "201" Facilities Planning Grant be revised to investigate only the alternatives for independent expansion of the three existing treatment plants, Inverness, Troutdale and Gresham.

3. That an additional Work Plan task be added to the Consortium "201" Feasibility Study to evaluate the potential of regional administration, operation, sludge disposal and finance for the three independent plants.

4. That the Executive Officer forward a copy of this Resolution, and the Staff Report attached hereto as Exhibit "A," to the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and affected local agencies for appropriate action.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 18th day of December, 1980.

  
Presiding Officer

JL:bb  
761B/135

A G E N D A   M A N A G E M E N T   S U M M A R Y

*Rev  
80-204*

TO:           Regional Planning Committee  
FROM:        Executive Officer  
SUBJECT:     Acknowledging the East Multnomah County Sewer Consortium  
Study as Complying with the Regional Waste Treatment  
Management Plan

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

A.   ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of Resolution for the purpose of Acknowledging the East Multnomah County Sewer Consortium Study as Complying with the Regional Waste Treatment Management Plan.

B.   POLICY IMPACT: The adopted "208" plan mandates that alternatives be analysed for disposal facilities in the East Multnomah County area. The East Multnomah County Sewer Consortium Study was conducted in accordance with that mandate (see Article V, Section 1(A)(2)(a)(IV)) of the Regional Waste Treatment Management Plan adopted on October 2, 1980, by Metro Ordinance No. 80-102.

The action requested is consistent with the procedures outlined in the "208" Regional Waste Treatment Management Plan and does not conflict with the adopted Five Year Operational Plan.

C.   BUDGET IMPACT:   None

II. ANALYSIS:

A.   BACKGROUND: In 1975, the Columbia Region Association of Governments (CRAG) initiated an extensive Areawide Waste Treatment Management Study for the Portland metropolitan area, which was financed in part through a Section "208" Planning Grant from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. In July, 1978, CRAG adopted the Regional Waste Treatment Management Plan developed under this study. In the Planning Process (Volume 2 of the Plan) all of the various options and combinations for waste treatment were analyzed by service region using the following criteria:

- . Cost: capital, operating and maintenance costs through year 2000;
- . Implementability: with regard to required institutional and management arrangements;
- . Environmental Impact: receiving water quality as well as construction-related impacts;

- . Reliability: ability to consistently meet water quality standards;
- . Flexibility: ability to adapt to changing conditions of growth patterns, operational requirements, etc.;
- . Energy Consumption: all alternatives considered were net energy producers, some are more energy efficient than others.

In the Columbia Service District (plants discharging to the Columbia River), the final analysis was inconclusive. Option #7, which recommended a regional plant at Gresham and the abandonment of the Inverness and Troutdale plants, was slightly favored. Because this analysis was inconclusive a more detailed investigation, as part of a "201" Facilities Planning Study, was recommended.

The three management agencies involved, Multnomah County, Gresham and Troutdale, formed a Consortium and applied for a "201" planning grant as the "208" plan recommended. Delays and cutbacks in the "201" grant program and the prospect of a building moratorium in the study area prompted the Consortium to begin the study with local funds. The study, prepared by Lee Engineering, Inc., is the result of this effort.

- B. **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:** As required by the "208" plan, the Consortium Study evaluated the regional alternative (expansion of the Gresham Treatment Plant to serve the entire area) vs. individual expansion of the three existing plants (Gresham, Troutdale and Inverness). The study concentrated on the economic factors, capital as well as operation and maintenance costs, of each alternative. Three analysis methods were used and in each case, the difference in cost between alternatives was less than the accuracy of the analysis method. Because of this, Metro staff re-evaluated the options against the other criteria considered in the "208" plan.
- C. **CONCLUSION:** The cost advantage of one alternative over the other is not apparent from the analysis performed and differs according to the methodology employed. When cost is ignored, and the alternatives are evaluated against the other criteria, the independent expansion alternative is definitely favorable (see Table 1 in Exhibit A).

These facts were considered by the Water Resources Policy Alternatives Committee (WRPAC) in unanimously passing the following recommendation:

"It is recommended that the Consortium Study be accepted as partial compliance with [the "208"] mandate and that the Scope

of Work for the Consortium "201" Study be revised. In addition to the feasibility analysis of each individual plant expansion, the potential for regional administration, operation, sludge disposal and finance should be included in this study."

JL:bb  
760B/135