SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Noel King, Director

County Government Center, Room 207 • San Luis Obispo CA 93408 • (805) 781-5252

Fax (805) 781-1229 email address: pwd@co.slo.ca.us

TO: **Los Osos Wastewater Project Technical Advisory Committee**

FROM: **John Waddell, Project Engineer**

DATE: **May 7, 2007**

SUBJECT: **Los Osos Wastewater Project Technical Advisory Committee Review of Project Alternatives**

Recommendation

It is our recommendation that this Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) continue its review of project alternatives.

Discussion

Today's TAC meeting will continue the discussion and review of the project alternatives. Discussion is anticipated to include the following topics:

- Chairperson Comments (5 minutes)
- Working Group reports (15 minutes)
  - Financial Working Group
  - Environmental Working Group
  - Engineering/Water Resources Working Group
- Review of Core Values and Pro/Con Criteria for Pro/Con Analysis (75 minutes)
- Upcoming meetings schedule (10 minutes)
- Public Comment Period (30 minutes)

The discussion of project alternatives is intended to include the entire scope of the TAC. Therefore, all public comment will be considered to be relevant to the agenda.

Results

The TAC's review of project alternatives will help provide objective information to the Community of Los Osos.

Attachments: Working Groups Core Value Summary
Criteria Check Sheets, 5 pages
TAC Meeting Schedule

File: CF 310.85.02 Los Osos Wastewater Treatment Plant

Working Groups Core Value Summary

Finance Working Group

Core Values

- Sustainability: Achieve groundwater balance and ensure source for clean drinking water.
- Community socio-economic well-being and diversity: “Nobody should have to leave their home to pay for a sewer.”
- Environmental stewardship: Protect this place we call “home” and love so dearly.
- Help rebuild relationships within the community.

Environmental Working Group

Core Values

- We are members of the Los Osos community and we are working on behalf of our community to help provide clear, objective, and accurate information about the environmental pros and cons of different alternatives.
- Doing nothing is not an option – we need improved wastewater treatment in Los Osos to address ongoing and significant pollution of our aquifer and the Morro Bay Estuary.
- All projects will have environmental positives and negatives
- We encourage community input and participation and we will incorporate that input in our efforts and share it with the County Team.

Engineering and Water Resource Working Group

Preamble

- We are members of the Los Osos community and we are working on behalf of our community to help provide clear, objective, and accurate information about the pros and cons of different alternatives.
- Doing nothing is not an option – we need improved wastewater treatment in Los Osos to address ongoing and significant pollution of our aquifer and the Morro Bay Estuary.
- We encourage community input and participation and we will incorporate that input in our efforts and share it with the County Team.

Core Values

- Long term control of all components of our wastewater system.
- Flexibility for future
- Stewardship of the water basin
- Optimize capitol investment and life cycle costs
- Community support
- Environmental sensitivity

Grades – Very good=?, Good=?, Neutral=?, Poor=?, Very poor=?

Project: _____

Water Resources

	Grade	Comment
Collection System		**Overall**
Processing Plant		**Overall**
Effluent quality		
Plant Site		**Overall**
Effluent Disposal		**Overall**
Aquifer recharge		
Saltwater intrusion		
Purveyor participation		
Solids Disposal		**Overall**

Grades – Very good=?, Good=?, Neutral=?, Poor=?, Very poor=?

Project: _____

Environment	Grade	Comment
Collection System		**Overall**
Construction disturbance		
Size		
Impact on flora and fauna		
Visual impact		
Private property impact		
Odor		
System failures		
Archaeological Risk		
Processing Plant		**Overall**
Construction disturbance		
Size		
Impact on flora and fauna		
Visual impact		
Odor		
System failures		
Plant Site		**Overall**
Construction disturbance		
Size		
Impact on flora and fauna		
Visual impact		
System failures		
Community acceptance		
Effluent Disposal		**Overall**
Construction disturbance		
Size		
Impact on flora and fauna		
Visual impact		
Odor		
System failures		
Solids Disposal		**Overall**
Construction disturbance		
Size		
Impact on flora and fauna		
Visual impact		
Odor		
Traffic		
System failures		

Grades – Very good=?, Good=?, Neutral=?, Poor=?, Very poor=?

Project: _____

Cost	Grade	Comment
Collection System		**Overall**
Construction		
Maintenance		
Operating		
Energy		
Private property impact		
Archaeological Risk		
Construction Risks		
Processing Plant		**Overall**
Construction		
Maintenance		
Operating		
Plant Site		**Overall**
Maintenance		
Land		
Effluent Disposal		**Overall**
Construction		
Maintenance		
Operating		
Solids Disposal		**Overall**
Construction		
Maintenance		
Operating		

Grades – Very good=?, Good=?, Neutral=?, Poor=?, Very poor=?

Project: _____

Technology	Grade	Comment
Collection System		**Overall**
State of the art		
Maintainability		
Projected life		
Reliability		
Expandability		
Energy requirements		
Private property impact		
System failures		
Processing Plant		**Overall**
State of the art		
Maintainability		
Projected life		
Expandability		
Energy requirements		
System failures		
Plant Site		**Overall**
Location		
Access		
Expandability		
System failures		
Community acceptance		
Effluent Disposal		**Overall**
State of the art		
Maintainability		
Projected life		
Expandability		
Energy requirements		
System failures		
Solids Disposal		**Overall**
State of the art		
Maintainability		
Projected life		
Expandability		
Energy requirements		
System failures		

Grades – Very good=?, Good=?, Neutral=?, Poor=?, Very poor=?

Technology	Cost	Environment	Water Resources
Collection System			
State of the art	Construction	Construction disturbance	
Maintainability	Maintenance	Size	
Projected life	Operating	Impact on flora and fauna	
Reliability	Energy	Visual impact	
Expandability	Private property impact	Private property impact	
Energy requirements	Archaeological Risk	Odor	
Private property impact	Construction Risks	System failures	
System failures		Archaeological Risk	
Processing Plant			
State of the art	Construction	Construction disturbance	Effluent quality
Maintainability	Maintenance	Size	
Projected life	Operating	Impact on flora and fauna	
Expandability		Visual impact	
Energy requirements		Odor	
System failures		System failures	
Plant Site			
Location	Maintenance	Construction disturbance	
Access	Land	Size	
Expandability		Impact on flora and fauna	
System failures		Visual impact	
Community acceptance		System failures	
		Community acceptance	
Effluent Disposal			
State of the art	Construction	Construction disturbance	Aquifer recharge
Maintainability	Maintenance	Size	Saltwater intrusion
Projected life	Operating	Impact on flora and fauna	Purveyor participation
Expandability		Visual impact	
Energy requirements		Odor	
System failures		System failures	
Solids Disposal			
State of the art	Construction	Construction disturbance	
Maintainability	Maintenance	Size	
Projected life	Operating	Impact on flora and fauna	
Expandability		Visual impact	
Energy requirements		Odor	
System failures		Traffic	
		System failures	

TAC Meeting Schedule

Date	Location	Time
Monday, May 7, 2007	Government Center	12 Noon
Tuesday, May 15, 2007	Community Center	07:00 PM
Monday, May 21, 2007	Government Center	12 Noon
Monday, June 4, 2007	Government Center	12 Noon
Monday, June 11, 2007	Community Center	07:30 PM
Monday, June 18, 2007	Community Center	07:30 PM
Tuesday, June 26, 2007	Community Center	07:30 PM
Monday, July 2, 2007	Community Center	07:30 PM
Monday, July 9, 2007	Community Center	07:30 PM
Monday, July 16, 2007	Community Center	07:30 PM
Tuesday, July 24, 2007	Community Center	07:30 PM
Monday, July 30, 2007	Community Center	07:30 PM

LOS OSOS WASTEWATER PROJECT
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

San Luis Obispo County Department of Public Works

Meeting Minutes **Monday, April 23, 2007**

1) Call to Order/Roll Call: Approximately 12:05 pm, Chairman Garfinkel called the meeting to order. Absent: Don Asquith.

2) Agenda Item 1, Approval of Meeting Minutes from April 9, 2007: No public comment. **Karen Venditti motion to accept minutes as submitted, Bob Semonsen second. Motion carries.**

3) Agenda Item 2, Chairperson's Comments and Working Group Reports:
Opening comments by Chairman Bill Garfinkel. Discusses public meetings of working groups, advisory committee consideration of public comments and input, and the need for more public outreach. Discusses development of criteria for the Pro/Con analysis and the County's project alternatives review process.

   a. Financial Working Group: Discussion and written summary of items from April 13, 2007 working group meeting (attached).
   b. Environmental Working Group: Discussion and written summary of items from April 12, 2007 working group meeting (attached).
   c. Engineering Working Group: Discussion and written summary of items from April 20, 2007 working group meeting (attached).

   Public comment on Agenda Item 2:
   Al Barrow: Discusses development of a privately financed project, biosolids, and STEP collection systems.

   Richard Margetson: Discusses working group interaction at advisory committee meetings and population estimates in Chapter 1 of Rough Screening Report.

   Dave Duggan: Discusses working group reports and public information.

   Advisory committee response to public comment: County Planning Department has been contacted regarding estimates of future population. Advisory committee is in process of gathering information. **No action taken.**

4) Agenda Item 3 Advisory Committee Review of Project Alternatives:
John Waddell presented Chapter 5—Treatment Facility Siting Alternatives. (Handout attached)

Advisory committee discussion on issues related to Chapter 5, including creek crossing feasibility, proximity to disposal and reuse areas, eliminated in-town site alternatives, numbering errors on Fig. 5.1, potential growth inducing impacts, and related piping costs.

John Waddell presented Chapter 6—Collection System Alternatives. (Handout attached)
Advisory committee discussion on issues related to Chapter 6, including possible SRF loan requirements for STEP system, eliminated vacuum and low pressure alternatives, contact with other STEP system operators, and possible odor control.

Public comment on Agenda Item 3:
Gordon Taylor: Quotes excerpts from letter by Tom Ruehr regarding County process for CEQA and Proposition 218.

Dave Duggan: Discusses potential for terminal wetlands, out of town treatment plant siting, and regional project alternatives.

John Michener: States that he lives on Falcon Ridge near the cemetery. Discusses treatment plant siting impacts to out of town properties.

Chuck Cesena: Discusses CEQA process related to Tri-W and example of Watsonville High School regarding growth inducing impacts.

Al Barrow: Discusses STEP collection system piping, inflow and infiltration, and storage requirements.

Gail McPherson: Discusses recent visit to Charlotte County, FL to see STEP collection system and advisory committee analysis.

Richard Margetsen: Discusses imported water and flow assumption in Chapter 1.

Sandra Bean: Discusses imported water, water costs, and impacts of zoning change on future population estimates.

Advisory committee response to public comment: Questions whether vacant lots will be included in Proposition 218 assessments. Request for discussion of core values and criteria on next agenda. Discussion of process for Pro/Con analysis. **No action taken.**

5) Date of next advisory committee meeting: Monday, May 7, 2007 at 12:00 pm in San Luis Obispo.

6) Meeting adjourned at approximately 2:30 pm.

SLO COUNTY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE LOS OSOS WASTE WATER PROJECT

ENGINEERING/WATER RESOURCES SUB-COMMITTEE REVIEW OF ROUGH SCREENING ANALYSIS, CHAPTERS 3 & 4

MEETING DATE: FRI. 4/20/07 3:00- 5:00 P.M.
ATTENDEES: DIANA HAINES, JOHN WADDELL, JOHN BRADY, JOHN FOUCHE
RUSS WESTMANN, BOB SEMONSEN

CRITERIA ESTABLISHED

CHAPTER 3- TREATMENT TECHNOLOGY

FLEXIBILITY OF TREATMENT PROCESS TO MEET FUTURE NEEDS AND REGULATIONS

DEMONSTRATED RELIABILITY OF PROCESS

EFFECT OF PROCESS ON BIO-SOLIDS PRODUCTION

COSTS- CONSTRUCTION, REPLACEMENT, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ELECTRICITY

CHAPTER 4- BIO-SOLIDS TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL

MAINTAIN CONTROL OF DISPOSAL PROCESS

FLEXIBILITY OF BIOSOLID PROCESS AND DISPOSAL

NUISANCE ASSESSMENT OF BIO-SOLIDS PROCESS AND DISPOSAL

COST OF PROCESS FACILITIES, O & M, AND ULTIMATE DISPOSAL

INFORMATION REQUESTS

TREATMENT PERFORMANCE PARAMETERS FOR WASTE WATER PLANT

SLO County Technical Advisory Committee for the Los Osos Wastewater Project

Environmental Working Group – 2nd Report

Meeting Date: April 12th, 2007, 10:00-12:00 AM

Attendees: Dan Berman, Marshall Ochylski, Don Asquith, Maria Kelly, Paavo Ogren, Mark Hutchinson

Topics discussed include:

- Revisions to the overall Environmental Criteria,
- Revisions to our Chapter 2 Criteria
- Criteria specific to Chapters 3 and 4
- Draft Guiding Principles for the Working Group

Overall Environmental Criteria:
As the Environmental Group proceeds through this criteria development it should be expected that there will be an ongoing refinement of our criteria list. Changes have been marked with an asterisk for clarification. It is important to this group that we are as prepared as possible prior to the reviewing of the DRAFT Fine Screening Report.

Specific Changes:

- Salt Water Intrusion considerations should become a sub-topic of Ground Water Management
- Solids Handling now has one sub-topic: Volume
- Construction Impacts have been identified as applicable for Pro/Con analysis and has been added for review.

Overall Revised Criteria
Environmental Criteria (and sub-criteria) identified as applicable to a Pro/Con Analysis of the proposed project include:

Ground Water Management
- **Balance**
- **Quality**
- ***Salt Water Intrusion***

Surface Water Quality
- **Tributaries**
- **Estuary**

Biological/Botanical Resources
Archaeological Resources
Land Use Compatibility
- **Impacts on Agricultural Lands**
- **Odors**

Noise
Visual Resources
Solids Handling
Volume
Energy Use
Construction
Operational
Growth Inducement
Construction Impacts

Our Chapter 2 Criteria list is amended as follows (in order of importance):

- **Ground Water (Balance, Quality, *and Salt Intrusion)**
- **Surface Water Quality**
- **Biological/Botanical Resources (Impacts on the land required for disposal)**
- ***Impacts on Agricultural Lands**
- **Visual Resources**

Rough Screening Chapters 3 and 4:
Environmental Criteria particularly applicable to the Pro/Con Analysis of Chapter 3 and 4 in order of importance:
Chapter 3
Biological/Botanical Resources (Size of parcel necessary for treatment technology)
Archaeological Resources (Size of parcel necessary for treatment technology)
Land Use Compatibility (Size of parcel necessary for treatment technology)
Visual Resources
Energy Use
Chapter 4
Solids Handling
Odor

Guiding Principles:
In our review of the previous full TAC meeting, we discussed the idea of our "Guiding Principles". We agreed on the following 4 general concepts that will be refined as we continue the process of developing our Pro/Con analysis criteria and eventual review of project alternatives.

- We are members of the Los Osos community and we are working on behalf of our community to help provide clear, objective, and accurate information about the environmental pros and cons of different alternatives.
- Doing nothing is not an option – we need improved wastewater treatment in Los Osos to address ongoing and significant pollution of our aquifer and the Morro Bay Estuary.
- All projects will have environmental positives and negatives
- We encourage community input and participation and we will incorporate that input in our efforts and share it with the County Team.

TAC Financial Working Group
Meeting 4/13/07

A. Paavo reported on Rep. Visclosky's (chair of House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water) visit to Los Osos on Thursday, which included U.S. Rep. Capps, CA Rep. Blakesly, County Supervisor Gibson, and staff from the USDA, Regional Water Board, and the County. (See article in Bay News.) He indicated there was a positive response but no promises.

B. Paavo briefed the Finance committee on County counsel's position on the Brown Act in regards to the TAC individual committees. These groups are considered Ad-Hoc Committees as long as they stay focused solely on their individual purpose in regards to the process.

C. Discussion of public concerns regarding the County's process, in which the Advisory Vote comes after the Prop 218 vote. It was noted that the County recognizes the importance of public confidence in the process. It was also emphasized that any public efforts to address the process will be most effective when they work through the County staff and demonstrate agreement before presenting to Board of Supervisors.

D. Discussion of core values and draft Criteria. The attached form is intended to capture criteria offered by the other working groups so that it is an effective tool for the full TAC.

Next meeting will be held at 10:00 AM on Monday, 4/23, prior to the full TAC meeting at noon. (Bring a sack lunch.)

LOWWP Technical Advisory Committee

CORE VALUES

- Sustainability: Achieve groundwater balance and ensure source for clean drinking water.
- Community socio-economic well-being and diversity: "Nobody should have to leave their home to pay for a sewer."
- Environmental stewardship: Protect this place we call "home" and love so dearly.
- Help rebuild relationships within the community.

CRITERIA FOR PROS & CONS

Draft 4/9/07

CRITERIA	Collection System	Treatment Technology	Disposal/ Reuse	Solids	Siting	Overall
BEST COST (factors contributing to lowest bottom-line monthly cost to property owner)						
1.Lowest cost to construct, including: - Land acquisition - Road impacts, repairs - Potential engineering constraints regarding funding - Potential phases to ease project cost 2. Cost for individual hook-up 3.Lowest cost to operate & maintain, including: - Energy requirements - Labor - Disposal, sludge management - Cost to repair, replace, upgrade 4.Financial risks, incl. - Cost to clean up potential spills and respective fines - Cost of potential lawsuits 5. Future water supply: - Cost comparison to import State water vs. higher level of treatment						
BEST FUNDING FACTORS						
1.Eligible for best financing, incl. - Low rate - Terms - Points, closing costs - Engineering constraints - Flexibility and timing 2.Grant-eligible, attractive 3. Attractive to 3rd party financial participation, eg. water purveyors 4. Potential source of revenue						

Rough Screening Approach

- **Basis of Component Evaluation**
  - **Fatal Flaw Analysis**
  - **Elimination of Redundancy**
  - **Removal of Equivalent Components**

Project Components

- **Effluent Disposal/Reuse**
- **Treatment Technology**
- **Solids Treatment and Disposal**
- **Treatment Plant Siting**
- **Collection System**

Treatment Facility Siting Alternatives

- **Continuing Project Alternatives**
  - South of LOVR
  - Cemetery Area
  - Tri-W
- **Eliminated Alternatives**
  - In-Town and Edge-of-Town sites other than Tri-W
    - Regulatory and environmental constraints
    - No significant advantage to Tri-W (Proximity to Urban Area)
  - Northern Area (i.e. Turri Road vicinity)

Collection System Alternatives

- **Continuing Project Alternatives**
  - Dedicated Conventional Gravity
  - Combined Conventional Gravity, Vacuum and/or Low-Pressure
  - STEP/STEG
- **Eliminated Alternatives**
  - Dedicated Vacuum
  - Dedicated Low-Pressure