

RESOLUTION NO. 1-89

A RESOLUTION CERTIFYING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT  
REPORT AND ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATED THERETO  
RELATIVE TO THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT EXPANSION

RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the Sewer Authority  
Mid-Coastside, San Mateo County, California, as follows:

WHEREAS, this Board of Directors (the "Board") of the Sewer  
Authority Mid-Coastside (the "Authority") has determined that  
wastewater treatment capacity must be expanded in order to meet  
the demand anticipated from urban growth under approved land  
use plans while continuing to meet wastewater requirements;

WHEREAS, on the 27th day of December, 1976, this Board did,  
by its Resolution No. 16-76, adopt local guidelines  
implementing the California Environmental Quality Act statutes  
(the "Law") and guidelines thereunder adopted by the Secretary  
of Resources (the "Guidelines") and on the 26th day of March,  
1984, the Board did by its Resolution No. 10-84 adopt revised  
local guidelines implementing amendments to the Law and  
Guidelines;

WHEREAS, for the purposes of the expansion of the  
Authority's wastewater treatment plant (the "Project"), it has  
been the intention of this Board to incorporate by reference  
into its local guidelines all material and applicable changes  
thereto based upon any and all changes in, additions to, and  
deletions from the Law and Guidelines effected since March 26,  
1984, and the Authority has duly followed said Law and  
Guidelines in its consideration of the Project;

WHEREAS, the Board having determined under Section 15081 of  
the Guidelines that an Environmental Impact Report (the "  
EIR") would be required for the Project, the Authority  
promulgated, on December 21, 1987, a Notice of Preparation to  
all Responsible Agencies (as defined in the Law and Guidelines)  
as well as to every federal agency involved in approving or  
funding the Project and to each Trustee Agency (as defined in  
the Law and Guidelines) responsible for natural resources  
affected by the Project, as required by and in compliance with  
Section 15082 of the Guidelines;

WHEREAS, the Authority engaged in early consultation with  
persons and organizations it believed to be concerned with the  
environmental effects of the Project as authorized under  
Section 15083 of the Guidelines;

WHEREAS, the Authority contracted with Thomas Reid Associates ("TRA") for the preparation of the draft EIR, and TRA completed preparation of the draft EIR in conformity with Article 9 (beginning with Section 15120) of the Guidelines;

WHEREAS, the Authority considered all information and comments received by it intended to assist in the preparation of the draft EIR and subjected the draft EIR to the Authority's own review and analysis as required by Section 15084 of the Guidelines;

WHEREAS, the draft EIR sent out for public review on July 6, 1988 reflected the independent judgment of the Authority as required by Section 15084(e) of the Guidelines;

WHEREAS, the Authority filed with the Office of Planning and Research a Notice of Completion complying with the requirements set forth in Section 15085 of the Guidelines immediately upon completion of the draft EIR;

WHEREAS, the Authority consulted with and requested comments on the draft EIR from all Responsible Agencies, Trustee Agencies and other state, federal and local agencies which exercise authority over resources which may be affected by the Project as required by Section 15086 of the Guidelines;

WHEREAS, the Authority in conformance with Section 15087 of the Guidelines, and as otherwise required by law for the Project, provided public notice on July 11, 1988 of the availability of a draft EIR to all organizations and individuals who had previously requested such notice as well as by publication in the Half Moon Bay Review, the San Mateo Times and The Beachcomber, and provided for a period of public review lasting 60 days;

WHEREAS, the Authority, as authorized in Section 15087 of the Guidelines, furnished copies of the draft EIR to the public library systems serving the Project area and made draft EIR's available to the public in the Authority offices;

WHEREAS, the Authority conducted public hearings on the draft EIR in conjunction with its regular Board meetings, as authorized by Section 15087 of the Guidelines;

WHEREAS, the Authority evaluated and responded to in writing all comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the draft EIR during the noticed comment period in compliance with the requirement set forth in Section 15088 of the Guidelines;

WHEREAS, on October 24, 1988, the Authority republished the Project's draft EIR as an amended document (the "Amended DEIR") for recirculation and review during a second, abbreviated (45 day) public review period upon determination by this Board that certain corrections and changes in the draft EIR were significant and material;

WHEREAS, the Authority subsequently followed for the Amended DEIR all steps outlined in the recitals set forth above as described for the draft EIR, and in compliance with Sections 15082 through 15088 of the Guidelines;

WHEREAS, the Authority prepared a final EIR in compliance with Sections 15089 and 15132 of the Guidelines;

WHEREAS, the final EIR was presented to this Board at its regular February 27, 1989 meeting for its review and consideration;

WHEREAS, this Board did, at its regular February 27, 1989 meeting, review and consider the final EIR in compliance with Section 15090 of the Guidelines;

WHEREAS, since the drafting of the EIR, both Montara Sanitary District and Granada Sanitary District have exhausted their non-priority capacity and are no longer issuing non-priority sewer permits, and the Board wishes to acknowledge such changes here inasmuch as they may be material and significant to anyone reviewing the record of this Project;

WHEREAS, it is the policy of the State of California and the Authority, as provided in the Law and Guidelines, that the Authority shall not approve a project if it would result in significant environmental impacts if it is feasible to avoid or substantially lessen these impacts;

WHEREAS, Section 15091 of the Guidelines requires that this Board make one or more of the following findings when approving a project for which a final EIR has been completed, and which identifies one or more potentially significant adverse environmental effects of the project, along with an explanation supporting each finding:

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR; or

(2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency; or

(3) Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR;

WHEREAS, the final EIR has identified two such impacts, described in Exhibits A and B attached hereto and by this reference incorporated herein, respectively; with respect to the impact described in Exhibit A, this Board desires to incorporate into the Project mitigation measures in order to avoid the potential impact; and, with respect to the impact described in Exhibit B, because certain mitigation measures are already in place, and because specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible further mitigation measures, and the benefits of the Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, this Board desires to adopt a statement of overriding considerations with respect thereto;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY FOUND, DETERMINED AND CERTIFIED as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct.
2. The final EIR has been completed in compliance with California Environmental Quality Act statutes, and guidelines thereunder adopted by the Secretary of Resources.
3. The final EIR was presented to this Board and this Board reviewed and considered the information contained in the final EIR prior to approving the Project.
4. The final EIR identifies a potentially significant environmental effect related to the handling of chlorine, as more particularly described in Exhibit A. With respect thereto, this Authority hereby adopts mitigation measure 3, described in Exhibit A, ("Mitigation Measure 3") that avoids the significant environmental effect also described in said Exhibit. This Authority hereby further adopts the following reporting and monitoring program with respect to Mitigation Measure 3, and hereby incorporates same into the Project in order to avoid the potentially significant environmental effect so identified:
  - a. The General Manager of the Authority (the "Manager") shall cause Mitigation Measure 3 to be incorporated into the design and construction of the Project.

b. The Manager shall monitor the Project implementation to ensure that Mitigation Measure 3 remains a part thereof.

c. The Manager shall periodically report to this Board with respect to the incorporation of Mitigation Measure 3 into the Project in order that this Board can ensure compliance with this Section during Project implementation.

5. This Board finds, supported by substantial evidence in the record and by the adoption of the reporting and monitoring program as set forth in Section 4 hereof, that changes or alterations have been required in and incorporated into the Project which avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR and described in Exhibit A.

6. This Board finds, supported by substantial evidence in the record, that, for the significant impact described in Exhibit B, specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible the Project alternatives identified in the final EIR, and that mitigation measures have been adopted by other public agencies (also as described in Exhibit B) within whose responsibility and jurisdiction such measures lie.

7. Relative to Section 6 above and to Exhibit B hereto, and in compliance with Section 15093 of the Law and the Guidelines, this Board makes and adopts the following statement of overriding considerations:

The expansion of wastewater treatment capacity is necessary in order to meet the demand anticipated from urban growth under already-approved land use plans while continuing to meet wastewater discharge requirements under the Clean Water Act and state and local laws. The Project will accommodate only the growth anticipated under the approved land use plans.

\* \* \* \* \*

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a resolution duly passed and adopted by the Board of Directors of the Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside, at a regular meeting thereof, held on the 27th day of February, 1989, by the following vote:

AYES: SCHUETRUM, OKONEK, ERIKSEN, BEDESEM, WALL, BRIODY

NOES: NONE.

ABSENT: PATRIDGE, FOGLI

ABSTAIN: NONE.

Helin R. Bedsem  
Chairman

COUNTERSIGNED:

Secretary

## EXHIBIT A

### Public Safety

#### Impact:

Risk of adverse effects caused by leak of liquid chlorine which evaporates to gas. Under normal operating conditions no impact in this area is expected. Only in the event of an emergency caused by an accident would this potential impact become an actual impact.

#### Mitigation 1:

Include method of handling outdoor spills caused by accidents during tank delivery in a hazardous materials management plan. Such a method may include foam or chemical treatment to neutralize the chlorine.

#### Effect/Effectiveness:

Effectiveness in part depends on the quality of the plan; chemical treatments are effective in preventing serious adverse impacts; the fact that people would be present at the time of the spill means that the problem can be remedied quickly as long as the people are trained in how to handle the situation.

#### Feasibility:

Feasible.

#### Responsibility:

SAM.

#### Mitigation 2:

Add an air scrubber to the vent on the chlorine storage building to neutralize chlorine gas resulting from indoor spills.

#### Effect/Effectiveness:

Will allow venting of spilled chlorine without adverse effects.

#### Feasibility:

Feasible; equipment has high capital costs.

**Responsibility:**

SAM.

**Mitigation 3:**

Use another chemical as a disinfectant.

**Effect/Effectiveness:**

Substitutes are less hazardous, either because they are generated on site (no storage) or because they are liquids and are easier to contain.

**Feasibility:**

Feasible; generally higher operating costs.

**Responsibility:**

SAM.



## EXHIBIT B

### Growth Inducement

#### Impact:

The wastewater treatment plant expansion will permit the population growth (and all of the accompanying environmental effects) anticipated under adopted land use plans (the Local Coastal Programs of the City of Half Moon Bay and the County of San Mateo, hereinafter the "LCP's").

#### Mitigation:

The LCP's operate to minimize the adverse impact of growth by limiting the amount of growth, by determining its type and location and by coordinating provision of public services. In this sense, the adopted LCP's are mitigation measures for the indirect impact of the wastewater treatment plant expansion.

#### Effect/Effectiveness:

Effective to mitigate the negative quality of growth and its accompanying adverse impacts, but not to mitigate the growth itself.

#### Feasibility:

Already in effect.

#### Responsibility:

City of Half Moon Bay; County of San Mateo.

#### Alternatives:

##### a. No Project

Under the No Project alternative the Authority would not expand the present treatment plant. As actual loads approached the 2.0 million gallons per day ("MGD") design capacity there would be increased operating costs and reduced reliability in effluent quality. With capacity fixed at 2.0 MGD, the member sewer service entities would most likely retain their present allotment of capacity (Montara: 0.4 MGD, Granada: 0.6 MGD, Half Moon Bay: 1.0 MGD).

The LCP's have set aside capacity for specified priority land uses such as commercial recreation, marine related industry, or affordable housing. Thus, not all of the

remaining wastewater capacity is available for non-priority uses such as conventional single family dwellings. Growth in non-priority land uses could occur until non-priority capacity were no longer available. The Montara Sanitary District and the Granada Sanitary District are no longer issuing non-priority sewer permits. The City of Half Moon Bay flows are below its allocated capacity, and it is still issuing non-priority capacity sewer permits. The City has a priority set-aside of 165,600 gpd.

No-Project would mean that the Mid-Coastside would be able to provide wastewater treatment to a 10% to 15% growth in the present population, based on present LCP priority allocations. The LCP's do provide for re-allocation of unused priority capacity to non-priority uses on an interim basis, pending expansion, but re-allocation may not be approved if no expansion is planned. Also, some further growth could occur by dwellings using septic tanks or by drastic wastewater reduction measures. None of these approaches would be able to accommodate the growth levels anticipated in the LCP's.

#### **b. Partial Expansion**

After making a preliminary determination of plant capacity needs, the Authority directed the engineers to study expansion to 4.0 MGD, and to study two intermediate expansion phases.

The two partial expansion scenarios are (i) increasing capacity first to 2.5 MGD and (ii) increasing capacity first to 3.0 MGD. The 2.5 MGD expansion would allow the changes recommended in the engineering study prepared by Kennedy Jenks Chilton ("KJC"), and a small increase in capacity. The total cost for the 2.5 MGD is estimated at \$2.2 million. Expansion to 3.0 MGD would allow a larger increase in capacity. The cost for this larger scaled plant is \$5.75 million.

Either alternative would solve immediate operations and capacity problems, but both would fall short of serving the growth described for the next twenty years in the LCP's. The amount of effluent, energy use, noise and air emissions would be proportionately less from a plant operating at a lower flow. However, the physical environmental impacts of the proposed plant, as mitigated, are not significant; the 2.5 or 3.0 MGD plant alternatives do not offer a significant environmental preference.

Their financial impact after the twenty-year service period is significant, as compared with the proposed Project. If a smaller plant alternative were pursued, additional capacity could be added in phases. KJC estimated the incremental cost

for phased expansion, considering the strict cost of building integrated treatment units at smaller sizes. Cost estimates have since been developed by Authority staff that reflect inflation and other costs that may attend starting another round of construction at a later date. The two step expansion (2 to 3 MGD; 3 to 4 MGD) would cost an estimated \$12.3 million and the three step expansion (2 to 2.5 MGD; 2.5 to 3 MGD; 3 to 4 MGD) would cost an estimated \$13.2 million. The proposed Project has an estimated cost of \$8.2 million.