



City of Biggs

Agenda Item Staff Report
For Regular City Council Meeting:
Nov 13, 2012 6:00PM

Date: Nov 7, 2012

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Steve Speights, PE – City Engineer

Subject: Proposal for CEQA / NEPA Process for Phase II Sewer Treatment Plant Improvement Project

Summary:

PMC has provided a proposal to complete the environmental process for Phase II of the Treatment Plant Improvement Project. Phase II includes property acquisition, the disposal of treated effluent to irrigated crop lands and storage ponds during non-irrigation conditions. This part of the project was not included in the original environmental evaluation for the previous project which was all on-site.

Requested Action:

After discussion, Council approval by voice vote of the PMC proposal for Tasks 1 through 8 in the amount of \$101,551.

Background:

The Phase II improvements include land acquisition and construction not included in the original treatment plant project, which was all on-site. CEQA and our State Revolving Fund application for funding require an environmental evaluation of the Phase II improvements. Because of our application to USDA for funding for the land acquisition, we must provide an environmental evaluation for USDA to follow the NEPA process.

Under both NEPA and CEQA an environmental evaluation must include a discussion of alternative actions and locations. We have been discussing the scope of the environmental evaluation with PMC over the past six months and have narrowed the location options to the point that we feel comfortable with proceeding. The PMC proposal attached includes evaluation of two locations suitable for the project needs.

PMC's proposal presents their company qualifications to complete the work and the qualifications of the people to be involved. In staffs opinion, PMC is qualified to complete the work proposed. PMC also prepared the environmental work on the original project. We are using that previous environmental work, with an updated project description, for the Phase I improvements.

The process, including preparing drafts, distribution, staff and interested party reviews, response to comments, agency consultations, and preparation of final documents for Council approval is expected to take about 12 months. A completed CEQA and NEPA document is necessary to secure a funding agreement with both SRF and USDA for Phase II.

The PMC proposal includes both the Tasks required to get to a complete CEQA and NEPA document and optional Tasks. We are requesting approval for only the required Tasks 1 through 8 at this time. Task 9 and Optional Task 3 should be returned to the Council for approval when determined that they are necessary or can be specifically defined, such as the future permitting. A budget is included in PMC's proposal for these future Tasks for information.

Attachments:

PMC proposal

Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of the PMC scope and fee for Task 1 through 8 in the amount of \$101,551. The fee is reasonable given the complexity of the project and environmental setting and the regulatory agencies involved.

Fiscal Impact:

This expense is contained in the project program budget and will be included in the costs submitted with our funding applications. The SRF and USDA funding programs are a reimbursement for monies spent basis. Once the funding is in place the City may request reimbursement for the incurred cost of PMC's work. The expense is expected to be spread out over the next year or so. The Council has identified the Electric Utility Reserve as the interim funding source.



PMC[®]



OUR WORLD REVOLVES AROUND YOURS

(866) 828-6PMC

WWW.PMCWORLD.COM

 Printed on Recycled Paper

A PROPOSAL TO

CITY OF BIGGS

WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT ENHANCEMENT PROJECT EIR

SUBMITTED TO:

CITY OF BIGGS
STEVEN C. SPEIGHTS
PE – CITY ENGINEER
C/O BENNETT ENGINEERING SERVICES
1082 SUNRISE AVE, SUITE 100
ROSEVILLE, CA 95661



OCTOBER 2012

SUBMITTED BY:

PMC[®]

140 INDEPENDENCE CIRCLE, SUITE C
CHICO, CA 95973
PHONE: (530) 894-3469
FAX: (530) 894-6459

(866) 828-6PMC

WWW.PMCWORLD.COM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
PMC Project Experience.....	2
Key Personnel.....	6
Scope of Work.....	10
Schedule.....	19
Budget.....	21

INTRODUCTION

The planned improvements to the City of Biggs Wastewater Treatment Plant are a result of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board's requirement to meet the City's existing waste discharge requirements. The City is proposing to develop a land disposal/land application method of disbursing treated wastewater generated from the existing wastewater treatment plant. The treated wastewater would be applied to land located directly east and south of the wastewater treatment plant. The City will be seeking to fund the acquisition of adjacent land with US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Utilities Service (RUS) funds and the physical construction costs (all costs not associated with land acquisition activity) with a State Revolving Fund (SRF) loan. The City is considering two alternative sites to acquire, including 1) approximately 145 acres located directly west and north of the wastewater treatment plant and 2) approximately 160 acres located directly south of the wastewater treatment plant. We note that the ultimate design of these facilities will be refined as the project moves forward.

The land acquisition component of the proposed project is anticipated to be funded by the USDA RUS, which requires compliance with RUS Environmental Bulletin 1794A-602 for National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance. The proposed project will also be analyzed under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as required by Section 21065 of the Public Resources Code. The facility improvements component of the proposed project is anticipated to be funded using a State Water Resources Control Board SRF loan. The environmental analysis of the proposed facility improvements will need to comply with the SRF loan eligibility requirements to assess the project's environmental impacts. Although the project is being vectored through the CEQA review process, the facility improvements funding is associated with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act) and federal funding triggers compliance with the Federal Endangered Species Act, Federal Clean Air Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. This process is commonly referred to as "CEQA-Plus," which is outlined in the 2004 Environmental Review Process Guidelines for State Revolving Fund Loan Applicants (CEQA-Plus Guidelines).

Based on the City's needs and our understanding of the project, PMC will complete preparation of the required CEQA and NEPA documents.

PMC has assembled a team of technical professionals in several disciplines to focus upon the preparation of a complete, objective, project-specific document in conformance with all the provisions of CEQA, CEQA-plus and USDA RUS Environmental Bulletin 1794A-602 for NEPA compliance.



PMC PROJECT EXPERIENCE

The following list of projects represents PMC's experience and history in performing work similar to the City's Wastewater Treatment Facilities Improvements project.

CITY OF JACKSON – WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT EIR

PMC prepared the Environmental Impact Report for improvements to the City's wastewater treatment plant and changes to the associated discharge practices in order to comply with more stringent Waste Discharge Requirements issued by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. The City proposed to improve the wastewater treatment plant (including wastewater treatment processes and effluent disposal methods) to meet the existing needs of the City of Jackson and future needs within the limits of the permitted capacity of the existing wastewater treatment plant. A key issue involved improving the City's wastewater effluent quality and disposal method in a manner that protects the existing beneficial uses of Jackson Creek and Lake Amador. Environmental issues evaluated in the Environmental Impact Report included air quality, biological resources, greenhouse gas emissions, cultural resources, hydrology and water quality, noise, and traffic.

COUNTY OF EL DORADO – UNION MINE DISPOSAL SITE SPRAY IS/MND

The project included the preparation of an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration that addressed the impacts associated with the expansion and continued operation of the spray fields at the Union Mine Disposal Site Wastewater Treatment Plant. At this facility, wastewater effluent and septage waste from El Dorado County is treated and sprayed into fields for absorption. Project issues included hydrology and water quality impacts associated with discharging treated effluent near area waterways, discharging treated effluent into an existing adjacent conveyance facility that did not previously accept discharge from the treatment plant, and hazards associated with slope stability below the spray fields during storm events. Completion of the environmental review was necessary for compliance with Waste Discharge Requirements by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.

CITY OF GREENFIELD – WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT AND WATER SYSTEM EXPANSION IS/MND

PMC prepared the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for expansion of the City's wastewater treatment plant and construction of a new well, reservoir, and pump station. These projects, which implement the City's Water and Wastewater Capital Improvement Plans, accommodate growth anticipated in the updated General Plan. Significant issues included biological resources and air quality.

LASSEN COUNTY – HERLONG WATER AND WASTEWATER FACILITY EXPANSION EIR

PMC prepared the Environmental Impact Report for the expansion of Herlong’s water and wastewater facility for Lassen County. As a result of the BRAC Act of 1995, Lassen County was offered more than 4,000 acres of land, which included the water and sewer system in the Herlong area. The Lassen County Reuse Authority proposed to accept the water and sewer system, and desired to develop new potable water supply sources, construct new water transmission and distribution facilities, rehabilitate existing systems as needed, and construct a sewage lift station, trunk and collection sewers, and new sewage treatment facilities. Environmental issues evaluated in the Environmental Impact Report included land use, geology and soils, and hydrology and water quality.

CITY OF LIVINGSTON – DOMESTIC WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT EIR

The City of Livingston proposes to expand its existing wastewater treatment plant in order to provide for the increasing capacity requirements. PMC is in the process of preparing the Environmental Impact Report for the Domestic Wastewater Treatment Plant (DWWTP) expansion project. The DWWTP expansion is to occur primarily within the existing 50-acre plant site, with the exception of new percolation ponds required under the proposed project. These ponds would be located on acreage located to the west of the existing project site. The DWWTP upgrade planning and design process considers several design options to address anticipated growth in the city. This programmatic Environmental Impact Report analyzes the expansion with respect to impacts to air quality, hydrology and water quality, utilities and infrastructure, and hazards.

CITY OF LIVINGSTON – INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT EIR

PMC prepared an Initial Study for the 83-acre Industrial Wastewater Treatment Plant (IWWTP), located within the northern portion of the city and providing wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal for the Foster Farms poultry processing facility, which is located immediately adjacent to the southwest of the site. The purpose of the proposed project was to provide adequate wastewater treatment capabilities sufficient to treat existing wastewater flows generated by the Foster Farms processing facility and to protect water quality. Poultry processing wastewaters typically contain relatively high concentrations of nitrogen from the addition of proteins to the wastewater; the existing IWWTP treatment ponds were not designed for nitrogen removal. The proposed project included the addition of two new oxidation ditches and related facilities associated with a biological nutrient removal process, which incorporated an extended aeration-activated sludge process into the existing treatment process for nitrogen removal, thereby resulting in a higher quality of treated wastewater for disposal and reclamation.



CITY OF TRACY – TRACY HILLS WASTEWATER AND STORM DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS EIR

PMC prepared a combined project and programmatic Environmental Impact Report to facilitate implementation of the Interim Wastewater Recovery Facility and Master Storm Drainage plan for the Tracy Hills Specific Plan. This Environmental Impact Report also included a programmatic evaluation of the permanent Wastewater Recovery Facility, to be implemented over the long-term build-out of this Specific Plan. This project included the delineation of specific pipeline and drainage corridors as well as specific locations of basin locations and interim and permanent wastewater treatment facilities for the Specific Plan area (consisting of 6,175 acres).

CITY OF TRACY – WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT PROJECT EXPANSION EIR

PMC prepared a combined project Environmental Impact Report to facilitate implementation of expansion and improvement of the City of Tracy's existing wastewater treatment plant. This involved improvement to plant operations, linear pipeline improvements, and improvements to its outfall in the Old River in the Delta. Key issues involved water quality associated with changes to discharges to the Delta and evaluation of potential land disposal alternatives.

MCCLLOUD COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT – MCCLLOUD WATER DISTRIBUTION PROJECT CEQA AND NEPA ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The proposed project consisted of replacement of the existing water distribution infrastructure that serves the community of McCloud. The water utility (including water source, storage, and distribution pipelines) is owned and operated by the McCloud Community Services District. The project involved the USDA Rural Development Rural Utilities program, which required CEQA and NEPA review. In addition, the project required five stream crossings and two crossings of State Route 89, which required permits from the California Department of Fish and Game as well as from the US Army Corps of Engineers. PMC prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration as well as the Environmental Report based on RUS Environmental Bulletin 1794A-602.

MCCLLOUD COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT – MCCLLOUD SEWER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS IS/MND

PMC was retained by the McCloud Community Services District to prepare an Initial Study for proposed improvements to the sewer collection system in the community of McCloud. The improvements involved the rehabilitation and replacement of sewer lines, with the intent of remedying sewer blockages and spills experienced with the existing sewer lines. The Community Services District sought federal and state funds for these improvements. The Initial Study, with supporting environmental studies, provided justification for a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project.

SQUAW VALLEY PUBLIC SERVICES DISTRICT – RESORT AT SQUAW CREEK WATER AND WASTEWATER IMPROVEMENTS SUPPLEMENTAL EIR

PMC was contracted to the Squaw Valley Public Services District to prepare an SEIR to address the provision of water and sewer services for Phase II of the Resort at Squaw Creek. The SEIR focused primarily on the impacts associated with the extraction of groundwater to serve the project. The project involved the review and compilation of dozens of technical reports, well logs, groundwater modeling, etc., to determine the interaction between ground and surface water resources in the vicinity. The extraction of groundwater has the potential to adversely impact surface water levels in Squaw Creek, which may in turn impact special-status species and jeopardize future water supplies.



KEY PERSONNEL

Following are brief descriptions of the qualifications of proposed key personnel.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Patrick Angell – Project Director

Mr. Angell is an associate principal and head of the PMC Environmental Services division. Mr. Angell works from PMC's Rancho Cordova office and serves as a project director, project manager, and senior technical analyst for a variety of projects. He specializes in environmental and urban land use planning and has performed comprehensive environmental reviews for projects such as water and wastewater facilities, energy facilities, flood control projects, residential subdivisions, mixed-use urban developments, and redevelopment plans. Mr. Angell's experience includes preparing urban land use and growth analyses, recreation and visual resource studies, public services assessments, transportation and circulation studies, and cultural resource analyses. He has overseen the preparation of hundreds of CEQA and NEPA documents and technical studies and has 20 years of experience preparing environmental documents.

- His wastewater treatment plant and facility experience includes the following projects:
- City of Jackson, Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement EIR
- City of Roseville, Roseville Regional Wastewater Treatment Service Area Master Plan EIR
- City of Tracy, Tracy Hills Interim Wastewater Reclamation Facility, Permanent Wastewater Reclamation Facility and Storm Drainage Improvements EIR
- City of Tracy, Tracy Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion EIR
- Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant Master Plan EIR
- El Dorado Irrigation District, Deer Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion EIR
- Squaw Valley Public Service District, Resort at Squaw Creek Phase II Water and Wastewater Improvements Supplemental EIR

Scott Friend – Project Manager

Mr. Friend is a senior associate in PMC's Chico office. He has over 12 years of experience in the planning profession serving both public and private clients. Mr. Friend manages the long-range and current planning services of PMC's Chico office. Mr. Friend is responsible for project management activities and provides technical review and oversight of office staff and projects. He specializes in urban land use planning and design and the review and preparation of entitlement requests and specific plans for large master-planned communities. Mr. Friend has provided principal direction and involvement in projects to include the preparation of general and specific plans, zoning ordinance amendments and revisions, the establishment of project review and administrative procedures, design review programs, flood control studies and the review and processing of various current planning activities to include development master plans, subdivisions, site plans, use permits, variances, and rezoning requests. Mr. Friend is currently involved in the preparation of a number of EIR projects, municipal annexations and municipal service reviews and has served as contract planning staff for the City of Biggs.

Todd Chambers, LEED AP – Senior Environmental Planner

Mr. Chambers is a senior project manager with more than 23 years of experience coordinating complex environmental compliance projects. He has led project teams composed of designers, engineers, biologists, environmental planners, technical specialists, cultural researchers, and economists applying creative vision to strategy development and implementation, due diligence and feasibility analyses, agency negotiations and conflict resolution, public outreach, and CEQA/NEPA and regulatory compliance. Mr. Chambers has led a variety of projects, including prison correctional and medical facilities, large master-planned communities, solar photovoltaic facilities, and a variety of local government projects. His master planning work has included numerous residential and school district projects, including challenging wastewater compliance issues. As a certified LEED AP planner, Mr. Chambers' approach to project management includes applying sustainable methodology to his work wherever possible to enhance his clients' projects and their environments.

Seth Myers – Environmental Planner/Air Quality Specialist

Mr. Myers is an environmental planner and specializes in air quality and greenhouse gas emissions analyses. He is involved in the preparation of initial studies/negative declarations, EIRs, and other CEQA documents as well as providing air quality analysis, greenhouse gas emissions analysis, environmental team support, and other research. Mr. Myers has prepared air quality analyses for a variety of projects including large and small residential subdivisions, commercial projects, and general plan updates. Mr. Myers is proficient in the use of URBEMIS 9.2.4, CALINE-4, EMFAC2007, and other industry standard air quality analysis tools. He has experience with planning and environmental projects, issues, and documents. In addition, Mr. Myers has provided landscape and irrigation plan review for development and public works projects, performed invasive weed eradication programs, and has prepared and monitored habitat-loss mitigation programs. Mr. Meyers has recently worked on two wastewater treatment plan and facility expansion EIR documents in the City's of Livingston and Jackson.



Joyce Hunting – Biological Resources Director

Ms. Hunting has more than 20 years of technical and practical experience working in California's diverse natural environments. She has 14 years of experience in preparing and managing the preparation of environmental documents that comply with the requirements of NEPA, CEQA, federal Endangered Species Act, California Endangered Species Act, California Public Utilities Commission, California Department of Transportation, State Reclamation Board, and local jurisdictions. She also has expertise in the preparation of US Army Corps of Engineers Individual and Nationwide Permit Applications, California Fish and Game Codes 1602 Streambed Alterations Agreements, habitat conservation plans, natural community conservation plans, wetland delineation and restoration plans, biological resource assessments and mitigation programs, and implementation of habitat conservation and restoration plans. Ms. Hunting's experience also includes conducting public participation programs.

Her wastewater treatment plan and facility experience includes the following projects:

- City of Santa Rosa, Santa Rosa Subregional Long-Term Wastewater Project EIR/EIS
- El Dorado Irrigation District, Deer Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion EIR
- Squaw Valley Public Service District, Resort at Squaw Creek Phase II Water and Wastewater Improvements Supplemental EIR
- City of Roseville, 12-mgd Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant Project Permitting

Summer Pardo – Senior Biologist

Ms. Pardo has 11 years of experience as a professional biologist and eight years as a consultant, with experience in completing multiple projects with competing deadlines. She combines extensive technical, analytical, and interpretive skills with practical field experience to achieve project goals. Ms. Pardo possesses strong interpersonal skills and experience working with multidisciplinary professionals to obtain various local, state, and federal permits and approvals. Areas of expertise include large-scale environmental and biological assessments, protected species habitat evaluations, population surveys, and permitting, local, state, and federal jurisdictional delineations and permitting, wetland and protected species mitigation plan development and impact analysis.

Lisa Westwood, MA, RPA – ECORP Consulting, Cultural Resources Specialist

PMC has teamed with ECORP Consulting for the proposed project’s cultural resources needs. Ms. Westwood is a Registered Professional Archaeologist with ECORP Consulting and has nearly 18 years of cultural resource management, contract archaeology, museum curation, and teaching experience in Northern and Central California, southern Utah, New Mexico, and the Midwest. She exceeds the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for prehistoric and historical archaeologist, holding a bachelor’s degree in anthropology and a master’s degree in anthropology (archaeology). Her technical areas of expertise include advanced Section 106 compliance and consultation, preparation and negotiation of agency agreement documents, human bone (osteological) identification and analysis, historical archaeology, and lithic debitage identification. Ms. Westwood is well versed in impact assessment and development of mitigation measures for CEQA and Section 106 (NHPA) projects. She regularly conducts evaluations of prehistoric and historic cultural resources for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places and California Register of Historical Resources, and is experienced in impact assessment and development of mitigation measures. She is the sole, co-, or contributing author to over 150 cultural resources technical reports, research designs, and cultural resource management plans. Her previous experience as a CEQA/NEPA project manager gives her a broader perspective of regulatory compliance issues.

SCOPE OF WORK

TASK 1: PROJECT INITIATION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Kickoff Meeting

PMC will meet with the City staff and project engineers to review the project description, project objectives, and initial environmental issues and will make a site visit. PMC will collect related project information. PMC will also review the contract and scope of work to ensure clear understanding of deliverables and timelines, as well as expectations for project information. We will also clarify how draft text will be reviewed and the protocol for distribution of project information.

Meetings: One project start-up meeting/site visit.

Deliverables: Draft project description including the APE map

Define Project Location and Description

PMC will create an area of potential effect (APE) map identifying the project location and area to be evaluated for biological and cultural resources, to be reviewed and approved by City staff and project engineers. PMC will create a working project description that will provide the basis for the environmental documents that will identify project features.

TASK 2: NOTICE OF PREPARATION/INITIAL STUDY

In order to determine the potential environmental effects of the project and to confirm the appropriateness of preparing an EIR and Environmental Assessment (EA), PMC will prepare a draft Notice of Preparation (NOP) and an associated Initial Study (IS) using the current CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Environmental Checklist. In addition to the IS, PMC will also prepare a technical memorandum that summarizes the results of the IS and will provide our recommendation for environmental review under CEQA, CEQA-plus and NEPA (through utilization of the USDA RUS Environmental Bulletin 1794A-602 Exhibit B).

Meetings: One public scoping meeting.

Deliverables: Five (5) hard copies of the Draft NOP and twenty (20) hard copies of the public draft NOP.

The NOP will include a brief discussion of each issue item in the Environmental Checklist, with a more thorough analysis given to those items that could result in potentially significant impacts. The draft IS will be prepared and provided to City staff for review and discussion. Upon edits from City staff, PMC will prepare the public draft NOP and will distribute it to the State Clearinghouse and will provide copies for City distribution. PMC will also facilitate one public scoping meeting on the NOP.

TASK 3: PREPARATION OF ADEIR/EA

The Administrative Draft EIR/Environmental Assessment (ADEIR/EA) will contain an analysis of potentially significant, adverse environmental effects of the project and will document whether any mitigation is needed in order to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Meetings: Conference calls on an as-needed basis

Deliverables: Five (5) hard copies and five (5) CD copies of the ADEIR/EA

The EIR will be prepared in accordance with the requirements of CEQA and will address NEPA and other federal items of concern that must be addressed as part of obtaining funding through such programs as the State Water Resources Control Board Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program, Community Development Block Grant, and USDA programs (Rural Community Assistance and Rural Utilities Service). The content of the EIR/EA and the work tasks for the individual topic areas are described below.

We will also prepare the checklist and associated exhibits (AD-1006, RECD 2006-38, and 81-93) for the Environmental Report for an EA as provided for under USDA RUS Environmental Bulletin 1794A-602 Exhibit B.

Conference calls with City staff will be held during the ADEIR/EA development process on an as-needed basis.

1.0 – Introduction

Chapter 1.0 of the Draft EIR/EA will provide an introduction and overview describing the intended use of the EIR and the review and certification process.

2.0 – Executive Summary (including matrix of project impacts and mitigation measures)

This chapter will summarize the characteristics of the proposed project and will provide a concise summary matrix of the project's environmental impacts and associated mitigation measures as required under CEQA Guidelines Section 15123.

3.0 – Project Description/Purpose and Need

The project description will identify the purpose and need of the project and include a statement of project objectives, the regional and local settings, a brief history of the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) and planning process for WWTP improvements, and project characteristics including required off-site improvements associated with effluent disposal and alternatives considered for the project. The project description will include details on WWTP operation and effluent disposal during past years (rates of effluent application), as well as project construction activities.



4.0 – Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

The following is a description of the individual environmental issue areas that will be evaluated in the EIR/EA.

Environmental Effects Found Not to be Significant

EIR/EA will identify that the project will not result in significant impacts to the following environmental issue areas:

- Coastal Zone
- Geology/Soils
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Wild and Scenic Rivers

The following environmental issue areas are anticipated to be further evaluated for the environmental analysis and we propose the following tasks to address them as consistent with CEQA and NEPA (CEQA-plus for State Revolving Fund compliance and RUS Bulletin 1794A-602 Exhibit B).

Agricultural Resources

The EIR will evaluate the effects of the project on the removal of land currently in cultivation for agricultural purposes. While it is anticipated that there may be no significant impacts associated with agricultural conversion issues as the intent of the use of all portions of the property not occupied by seasonal effluent holding ponds would be to maintain the land in active agricultural production, the EIR will evaluate the subject to address potential for agricultural impacts to due to operational issues as well as land use and design issues.

Aesthetic Resources

The EIR will evaluate the visual sensitivity associated with development of the proposed project. This will include documentation of the existing agricultural and rural landscape characteristics of the project area and specifically identifying how the wastewater effluent disposal would change the existing conditions.

Air Quality

The EIR will estimate (model) and address construction and operational air pollutant emissions from development of the project. This analysis would involve consultation with the Butte County Air Quality Management District (BCAQMD) and would determine if the project would fall under BCAQMD

thresholds as well as Federal Air Conformity Rule de minimis thresholds (10 tons per year of any criteria air pollutant).

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with short-term construction and long-term operation of the proposed project will be quantified. GHG emissions will be quantified using the URBEMIS 2007 computer program, utilization of energy use data for the wastewater treatment facility, and other operational emissions factors associated with the wastewater treatment process. The significance of GHG and climate change impacts will be determined in comparison to Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) and AB 32 Scoping Plan Report reduction targets. Mitigation measures will be incorporated to reduce any significant GHG impacts. The effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures will be quantified and discussed.

Biological Resources

The EIR will address the following resource impacts:

- Potential for project construction to impact wetlands, including waters of the US, that may trigger the need for permitting under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. It should be noted that this work program does not include preparation of a wetland delineation for submittal to the US Army Corps of Engineers.
- Determination of whether project construction would affect state or federally listed endangered or threatened species or listed critical habitat. This will also include an evaluation of any impacts to birds or raptors protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

This evaluation will consist of field review of the project site, resource database searches, utilization of available technical information on the Biggs area for biological resources of concern, and consultation with California Department of Fish and Game and US Fish and Wildlife Service. It is noted that the budget for this task does not include permitting work or any potential mitigation costs.

Cultural Resources

PMC has teamed with ECORP Consulting to prepare the cultural resources analysis for the proposed project. The CEQA-Plus Guidelines state that in order to avoid potential funding delays, the applicant should contact the cultural resources officer (CRO) of the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Financial Assistance to initiate the Section 106 consultation process. ECORP will participate in one conference call with the CRO and City staff and engineers to discuss the project and assist with developing the APE. This map will delineate the horizontal and vertical extent of the project activities. Typically, the APE is composed of the project footprint, as well as construction staging areas, stockpiling areas, detours, demolition sites, and, in some instances, view shed.

ECORP will carry out a records search and literature review for the APE with the Northeast Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System at California State University, Chico.



The purpose of this review is to obtain baseline information on a larger planning area within which all of the project alternatives would be expected to lie, plus a 0.5-mile radius. ECORP will also contact the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request a search of the Sacred Land File. ECORP will follow up with all contacts provided by the NAHC by letter and telephone to solicit contacts. ECORP will also make every reasonable attempt to confirm the construction dates of all structures within the APE, and will include any documentation in the report to the CRO. Such documentation may consist of parcel data on file with the County or City, historical aerial photographs, and historical topographic maps of the APE.

This task includes a peer review of previously conducted studies within the planning area to determine existing level of compliance. This helps eliminate duplicative studies and analyses, and makes use of existing baseline data whenever possible. ECORP will also ensure that complete copies of all sources sought are obtained from the Information Center for submission to the CRO, per the CEQA-Plus Guidelines.

If the records search and literature review indicate that the project area has been recently surveyed under current professional standards and agency guidelines, such that the APE is in compliance with the CEQA-Plus Guidelines, then Option 1 will apply. If, however, the current project area has not been surveyed under current standards and guidelines, and therefore, is not compliance with Section 106 or the CEQA-Plus requirements, then Option 2 will apply. Lastly, it may be the case that portions of the study area have been previously surveyed; in this case, ECORP will prepare a revised cost for Option 2, so that all applicable previous research can be applied to the current undertaking as much as possible.

Option 1: Section 106 Compliance Summary Letter

ECORP will prepare a compliance summary letter that serves to synthesize all cultural resources efforts and will pair them with the CEQA-Plus Guidelines. Prior survey reports will be appended to the letter report and will be submitted as a package to the CRO for review. This may involve utilization of the existing USDA Rural Development (RD) Programmatic Agreement and process with the California State Historic Preservation Officer. The draft report will be submitted to the client, electronically, within 45 days of the receipt of a notice to proceed and fully executed contract. ECORP will respond to one round of comments (assumed to be minor) and will prepare the final report (PDF).

Option 2: Field Survey and Report

ECORP will carry out an intensive pedestrian survey of the potentially affected properties using current protocols for the identification of cultural resources. ECORP assumes that no cultural resources will be identified on the property. ECORP will prepare a survey report, following the California Office of Historic Preservation's recommended content and format. The report will provide a survey coverage map, the historic context, which is also necessary for incorporation into the CEQA document, as well as the methods, results, and recommendations for appropriate findings and mitigation measures. The report will also indicate whether or not additional steps are required in order to support the CEQA document or

Section 106 process, based on the outcome of the inventory. The most common reason for additional analysis being required is the presence of cultural resources, which must be evaluated for significance to be compliant with Section 106, CEQA, and the CEQA-Plus Guidelines (which would require a contract change order).

The draft report will be submitted to the client, electronically, within 60 days of the receipt of a notice to proceed and fully executed contract. ECORP will respond to one round of comments (assumed to be minor) and will prepare the final report (PDF). In compliance with the terms of agreement between ECORP and the California Office of Historic Preservation, one unbound copy of the final report will be submitted to the appropriate confidential Information Center (presumed to be the NEC at Chico State) within 60 days of completion, where it will be archived and remain confidential (accessible only by qualified archaeologists; note that this is required, regardless of project status, and does not affect project approval).

Agency Technical Assistance:

During the course of its review of the project documentation and consultation under Section 106, the CRO or City may require clarification, additional supporting documentation, project meetings or site tours, and other information. This task budget will allow ECORP to respond to any such requests for information, assuming no new analysis is required, and will only be used if requested for miscellaneous requests for information.

Assumptions:

This scope does not include site recording, excavation, mapping, paleontological surveys, authoring environmental document sections, other requirements under state and federal law not specified above, hard copies of reports, project meetings, or conference calls; however, ECORP will gladly prepare a customized scope and cost for additional tasks upon request.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The hydrology and water quality analysis will be based on review of FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map as well as mapping available from the City and the Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency and will identify whether project features are within a flood hazard area. The EIR will also evaluate the potential for construction-related water quality impacts, aquifer impacts, and best management practices that would be conducted by the City.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This section discusses the potential for the project to create a significant hazard through the use, transport, or storage of hazardous materials, as well as possible impacts to emergency response plans. Any increases in waste byproducts and the ultimate treatment and disposal of material will be quantified and addressed.

Population/Housing/Socio-Economic and Environmental Justice Issues

The EIR/EA will identify the current demographic conditions of the project area and will identify and discuss any potential growth allowed under current land use designations and zoning. The EIR/EA will also address environmental justice issues to comply with NEPA requirements. While it is anticipated that no significant impacts will be identified as no displacement, relocation, or housing impacts will occur as a result of the project, the EIR will identify and analyze this issue as required.

Cumulative Impacts

The potential impacts of the project combined with the incremental effects of other approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable projects in the vicinity will be addressed.

Other Topics

This chapter will provide brief discussions of other topics specifically mandated by CEQA including unavoidable significant impacts and growth-inducing impacts of the proposed project. The growth inducement analysis will focus on the ability of the WWTP improvements to support existing and anticipated population growth in the city. Exhibits (AD-1006, RECD 2006-38, and 81-93) for the Environmental Report for an EA as provided for under USDA RUS Environmental Bulletin 1794A-602 Exhibit B will also be provided.

Project Alternatives

A range of reasonable project alternatives will be analyzed as required by Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines and NEPA. Each of the alternatives will be described in detail to provide a basis for the comparative impact evaluation. The analysis will compare the alternatives to the proposed project and will identify the environmentally superior alternative. A summary table will be provided to facilitate easy comparison of impacts among the alternatives and the proposed project.

TASK 4: REVISIONS TO THE ADEIR/EA AND PREPARATION OF DRAFT EIR/EA

PMC will meet with City staff and the project engineer to go over comments on the ADEIR/EA and discuss revisions. A revised ADEIR/EA will be prepared that incorporates the changes requested in revision marks for City review. Upon final review by City staff, final edits will be made to this document, and the public Draft EIR/EA will be prepared, along with the Notice of Availability. PMC will submit the Draft EIR/EA to the State Clearinghouse on behalf of the City and will assist the City on the distribution of the document (compilation of the mailing list).

PMC will plan on attending one public meeting on the Draft EIR/EA. PMC will also assist the City in posting of the Draft EIR/EA, as well as information on the DEIR/EA public meeting on the City's website.

Meetings: One (1) meeting to go over City comments on the ADEIR/EA and one (1) public meeting on the Draft EIR
Deliverables: Five (5) hard copies and five (5) on CD of the revised ADEIR in revision marks; twenty (20) hard copies of the Draft EIR and twenty (20) on CD

TASK 5: PREPARATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE FINAL EIR/EA

At the end of the review period, PMC will review the comment letters received and will meet with City staff and the project engineer to discuss the responses. The PMC project team will then prepare draft responses to comments, along with an EIR/EA errata section containing text corrections and revisions based on new information received during the public and agency review process. Upon completion, the Administrative Final EIR/EA will be submitted to City staff for their review.

Since it is difficult to predict the exact volume of comments that will be submitted on the DEIR/EA or the degree of controversy that the project will generate, the level of effort required to prepare responses to the comments cannot be estimated with accuracy. We have estimated receiving up to 10 letters of varying complexity based on previous experiences with similar projects.

Meetings: One (1) meeting review comments received on the Draft EIR/EA
Deliverables: Five (5) hard copies and five (5) on CD of the Administrative Final EIR/EA



TASK 6: REVISIONS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE FINAL EIREA AND PREPARE FINAL EIR/EA

PMC will meet with City staff and the project engineer to go over comments on the Administrative Final EIR and discuss revisions. A revised Administrative Final EIR/EA will be prepared that incorporates the changes requested in revision marks for City review. Upon final review by City staff, final edits will be made to this document, and the public Final EIR/EA will be prepared. PMC will assist on the distribution of the Final EIR/EA to public agencies that commented on the Draft EIR/EA, as required under CEQA.

PMC will plan on attending two public meeting on the Final EIR/EA and project consideration before the City Council. PMC will also assist in the posting of the Final EIR/EA to the City's website as well as information on public meetings conducted for the project.

Meetings: One (1) meeting to review City comments on the Administrative Final EIR/EA and two (2) public meetings before City Council

Deliverables: Five (5) hard copies and five (5) on CD of the revised Administrative Final EIR/EA in revision marks; twenty (20) hard copies of the Final EIR and twenty (20) on CD

TASK 7: CEQA FINDINGS/MMRP/FONSI/NOTICE OF DETERMINATION/RESOLUTIONS

As part of the EIR/EA preparation effort, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) will be prepared for the project pursuant to Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code. PMC will coordinate with the City and project engineer in designing the MMRP. The program will enumerate mitigation measures specified in the EIR/EA, identify the parties responsible, and indicate the time frame for implementation of monitoring for each mitigation measure.

Meetings: None

Deliverables: Preparation of draft and final CEQA Findings, FONSI, MMRP, NOD, Resolutions

PMC will also prepare the required CEQA Findings for project consideration, NEPA Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), and resolutions for certification of the EIR and approval of the proposed project. PMC will also draft the Notice of Determination (NOD).

TASK 8: MANAGEMENT OF EIR/EA PROCESS

PMC will manage the EIR/EA process and will be available at any time during the process to respond to any comments or issues identified by City staff as well as ensure that the proper notices and documentation are completed for both CEQA and NEPA compliance.

TASK 9: PERMITTING

PMC will assist the City in obtaining necessary permits (404 permit and 401 water certification) and associated consultations with US Army Corps of Engineers, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, and US Fish and Wildlife Service for WWTP improvements.

SCHEDULE

The following is the anticipated schedule to complete the EIR/EA and permitting.

Task	Weeks for Completion
Task 1 – Project Initiation and Description	2
Task 2 – Notice of Preparation (NOP)	
Draft NOP to City	3
City Review	2
Public Draft NOP	1
30-Day Public Comment Period	4
Task 3 – Preparation of ADEIR/EA	10
Task 4 – Revisions to ADEIR/EA and Preparation of DEIR/EA	
City Review of ADEIR/EA	4
Revised ADEIR/EA to City	2
City Review of Revised ADEIR/EA	2
Prepare Draft EIR/EA	1
Public Review (assume 45 days)	6
Task 5 – Preparation of AFEIR/EA	4
Task 6 – Revisions to AFEIR/EA and Preparation of FEIR/EA	
City Review of AFEIR/EA	3
Revised AFEIR/EA to City	2
City Review of Revised AFEIR/EA	1
Prepare FEIR/EA	1
Task 7 – CEQA Findings/MMRP/FONSI/Notice of Determination/Resolutions	2
Task 8 – Management of EIR/EA Process	Ongoing
Task 9 – Permitting	24

BUDGET



Tasks	Project Director	Project Manager	Senior Env. Planner	Env. Planner/ Air Quality	Bio Resources Director	Senior Biologist	Graphics, GIS, Tech Review	Admin Support	Total PMC Hours	Total PMC Labor	PMC Direct Costs \$	ECORP Consulting \$	Total Budget
	\$195	\$120	\$110	\$95	\$170	\$105	\$90	\$75					
EIR Required Tasks:													
1	Project Initiation and Project Description	4	8	4	12		2		30	\$3,500	\$175		\$3,675
2	Notice of Preparation/Initial Study	4	12	6	38		6	4	70	\$7,330	\$425		\$7,755
3	Preparation of ADEIR/EA	14	40	20	152	5	30	32	317	\$32,850	\$330	\$12,011	\$45,191
4	Revisions to ADEIR/EA and Preparation of DEIR/EA	6	20	8	50	4	6	16	124	\$13,000	\$2,300		\$15,300
5	Preparation of Administrative Final EIR/EA	8	24	10	48	3	10	14	137	\$14,420	\$220		\$14,640
6	Revisions to AFEIR/EA and Preparation of FEIR/EA	3	12	2	18		2	8	47	\$4,945	\$1,200		\$6,145
7	CEQA Findings/MMRP/FONSI/NOD/Resolutions	3	8		22				33	\$3,635	\$155		\$3,790
8	Management of EIR/EA Process	5	34						39	\$5,055			\$5,055
Total Required Tasks		47	158	50	340	12	48	72	797	\$84,735	\$4,805	\$12,011	\$101,551
Post-EIR and Optional Tasks:													
Post-EIR Task:													
9	Permitting				36	150			186	\$21,870			\$21,870
Optional Task:													
3	Cultural Resources Field Survey & Report											\$12,997	\$12,997
Grand Total Including Permitting		47	158	50	340	48	198	72	983	\$106,605	\$4,805	\$12,011	\$123,421
Grand Total Including Permitting and Optional Cultural Resources Task		47	158	50	340	48	198	72	983	\$106,605	\$4,805	\$12,997	\$136,417



(866) 828-6PMC

WWW.PMCWORLD.COM