

RESOLUTION NO. 2-89

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT
EXPANSION, AND AUTHORIZING THE FILING OF A
NOTICE OF DETERMINATION AND DIRECTING THE DISPOSITION
OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
WITH RESPECT THERETO

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

WHEREAS, on February 27, 1989, this Board of Directors (the
"Board") of the Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside (the "Authority")
certified that the final Environmental Impact Report (the
"Final EIR") for its Wastewater Treatment Plant expansion (the
"Project") had been completed in compliance with the California
Environmental Quality Act statutes ("CEQA"), and that the Final
EIR was presented to this Board and this Board reviewed and
considered the information contained in the Final EIR as
required under Section 15090 of the CEQA guidelines adopted by
the Secretary of Resources (the "Guidelines"); and

WHEREAS, on February 27, 1989, by its Resolution No. 1-89,
this Board approved findings, supported by substantial evidence
in the record, as required by Section 15091 of the Guidelines,
and the adoption of the reporting program under and as set
forth in Section 4 of said Resolution, that: (a) 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 hereto; (b) that, as to the significant impact described in
Exhibit B hereto, specific economic, social or other
considerations make infeasible the Project alternatives
identified in the Final EIR; and (c) that mitigation measures
have been adopted by other public agencies (also described in
Exhibit B) within whose responsibility and jurisdiction such
measures lie; and

WHEREAS, in said Resolution No. 1-89, this Board made
and adopted a statement of overriding considerations with
respect to the impact described in Exhibit B;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY FOUND, DETERMINED and ORDERED
as follows:

1. The Project is approved under CEQA and Section 15092 of
the Guidelines.

2. The General Manager of the Authority is hereby directed to file with the County Clerk of the County of San Mateo a Notice of Determination, as required by Section 15094 of the Guidelines, based on the findings in connection with the Project, and the Final EIR that this Authority has received, considered, adopted and approved.

3. In conjunction with the filing to be made pursuant to Section 2 hereof, the General Manager is directed to request of said County Clerk that information about said Notice of Determination be posted on a list of such notices pursuant to Subsection (d) of said Section 15094.

4. The General Manager of the Authority is hereby directed to effect the disposition of the Final EIR as required by Section 15095 of the Guidelines.

* * * * *

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a resolution duly and regularly 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.

Helen R. Bedesem

Chairman

COUNTERSIGNED:

James B. King

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.