

SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT

San Francisco District PUBLIC NOTICE

PROJECT: Sunnyvale Water Pollution Control Plant Primary Treatment Facility Project

PUBLIC NOTICE NUMBER: SPN-2014-00284

PUBLIC NOTICE DATE: May 4, 2015 COMMENTS DUE DATE: June 3, 2015

PERMIT MANAGER: Mr. Bryan Matsumoto TELEPHONE: 415-503-6786

E-MAIL: Bryan.T.Matsumoto@usace.army.mil

1. **INTRODUCTION**: The City of Sunnyvale, through its agent, H.T. Harvey and Associates (POC: Mr. Patrick Boursier, 408-458-3204), Post Office Box 3707, Sunnyvale, California 94089, has applied to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), San Francisco District, for a Department of the Army Permit to discharge fill material into jurisdictional waters of the United States associated with the construction of a new primary treatment facility at the Sunnyvale Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP) in the City of Sunnyvale, Santa Clara County, California. This Department of the Army permit application is being processed pursuant to the provisions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act of 1972, as amended (33 U.S.C. § 1344 *et seq*).

2. PROPOSED PROJECT:

Project Site Location: The proposed Sunnyvale Water Pollution Control Plant Primary Treatment Facility Project (Project) encompasses approximately six acres of the 16.6-acre main WPCP site. The WPCP is located at 1444 Borregas Avenue in the City of Sunnyvale, Santa Clara County, California (Section 17, Township 6S, Range 1W, United States Geological Survey 1:24K Quad Map: CA-Mountain View, Latitude (NAD83) 37.425361°N, Longitude (NAD83) 122.015107°W) (Sheets 1 and 2 of 6).

Project Site Description: The WPCP is adjacent to the shoreline of South San Francisco Bay. The site is generally surrounded to the west, south, and east by the Sunnyvale Landfill with various channels, ponds, and sloughs in adjacent areas to the north. Topography on the project site is generally flat to gentle sloping with slopes of zero to two percent, and consists of various existing water pollution control plant facilities. Features on the site subject to USACE jurisdiction include 4.06 acres of

wetlands (consisting of perennial wetland species such as cattails and club-rush, and also salt tolerant species such as pickleweed and salt grass), and 4.24 acres of perennial other waters of the U.S. (Sheet 3 of 6). These features receive hydrologic input from direct precipitation, urban run-off, and possible seepage though adjacent levees. The water is pumped out of these features north into Moffett Channel then to San Francisco Bay.

Project Description: The Project would construct a new primary treatment facility in the eastern portion of the main plant. This involves the installation of new influent pump station and pumps, screening facility, primary sedimentation tanks, chemically enhanced primary treatment facility and odor control system, associated features, and demolition of old facilities (Sheets 4, 5, and 6 of 6).

As shown in the attached drawings, work within USACE jurisdiction involves the discharge of approximately 25,000 cubic yards of clean, imported soil into the southeast channel and construction of an 84-inch by 168-inch box culvert within the channel to provide adequate flow.

Basic Project Purpose: The basic project purpose comprises the fundamental, essential, or irreducible purpose of the project, and is used by USACE to determine whether the project is water dependent. The basic project purpose is to upgrade the sewage primary treatment facility at the WPCP.

Overall Project Purpose: The overall project purpose serves as the basis for the Section 404(b)(1) alternatives analysis, and is determined by further defining the basic project purpose in a manner that more specifically describes the applicant's goals for the project,

while allowing a reasonable range of alternatives to be analyzed. The overall project purpose is to provide an updated sewage treatment facility within the City of Sunnyvale that preserves the public health and safety and is environmentally responsible.

Project Impacts: The Project would result in the permanent loss of 0.25 acre (721 linear feet) of jurisdictional other waters of the U.S. (perennial freshwater), and 0.02 acres of jurisdictional wetlands (freshwater emergent).

Proposed Mitigation: The current compensatory mitigation proposal involves the purchase of credits at the San Francisco Bay Wetland Mitigation Bank, which is a USACE approved mitigation bank. Impacts to perennial freshwater wetlands would be mitigated through the purchase of tidal wetland re-establishment at a 1:1 ratio and impacts to perennial freshwater other waters would be mitigated through the purchase of tidal open water at a 1:1 ratio.

H.T. Harvey and Associates has indicated that there may be an opportunity for the completion of compensatory mitigation on-site, however, a new proposal has not been submitted.

3. STATE AND LOCAL APPROVALS:

Water Quality Certification: State water quality certification or a waiver is a prerequisite for the issuance of a Department of the Army Permit to conduct any activity which may result in a fill or pollutant discharge into waters of the United States, pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act of 1972, as amended (33 U.S.C. § 1341 et seq.). The applicant has recently submitted an application to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to obtain water quality certification for the project. The applicant is hereby notified that, unless USACE is provided documentation indicating a complete application for water quality certification has been submitted to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) within 30 days of this Public Notice date, the District Engineer may consider the Department of the Army permit application to be withdrawn. No Department of the Army Permit will be issued until the applicant obtains the required certification or a waiver of certification. A waiver can be explicit, or it may be presumed, if the RWQCB fails or refuses to act on a complete application for water quality certification within 60 days of receipt, unless the District Engineer determines a shorter or longer period is a reasonable time for the RWQCB to act.

Water quality issues should be directed to the Executive Officer, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region, 1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400, Oakland, California 94612, by the close of the comment period.

Coastal Zone Management: Section 307(c) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 1456(c) et seq.), requires a non-Federal applicant seeking a federal license or permit to conduct any activity occurring in or affecting the coastal zone to obtain a Consistency Certification that indicates the activity conforms with the State's coastal zone management program. Generally, no federal license or permit will be granted until the appropriate State agency has issued a Consistency Certification or has waived its right to do so. The project does not occur in the coastal zone, and a preliminary review by USACE indicates the project would not likely affect coastal zone resources. This presumption of effect, however, remains subject to a final determination by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission.

Coastal zone management issues should be directed to the Executive Director, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, 50 California Street, Suite 2600, San Francisco, California 94111, by the close of the comment period.

Other Local Approvals: The applicant will be applying for the following additional governmental authorizations for the project: Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement to be issued by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

4. COMPLIANCE WITH VARIOUS FEDERAL LAWS:

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA): Upon review of the Department of the Army permit application and other supporting documentation, USACE has made a *preliminary* determination that the project neither qualifies for a Categorical Exclusion nor requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement for the purposes of NEPA. At the conclusion of the public comment period, USACE will assess the environmental impacts of the project in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. §§

4321-4347), the Council on Environmental Quality's Regulations at 40 C.F.R. Parts 1500-1508, and USACE Regulations at 33 C.F.R. Part 325. The final NEPA analysis will normally address the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that result from regulated activities within the jurisdiction of USACE and other non-regulated activities USACE determines to be within its purview of Federal control and responsibility to justify an expanded scope of analysis for NEPA purposes. The final NEPA analysis will be incorporated in the documentation that provides the rationale for issuing or denying a Department of the Army Permit for the project. The final NEPA analysis and supporting documentation will be on file with the San Francisco District, Regulatory Division.

Endangered Species Act (ESA): Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq.), requires Federal agencies to consult with either the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to ensure actions authorized, funded, or undertaken by the agency are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any Federally-listed species or result in the adverse modification of designated critical habitat. As the Federal lead agency for this project, USACE has conducted a review of the California Natural Diversity Data Base, digital maps prepared by USFWS and NMFS depicting critical habitat, and other information provided by the applicant, to determine the presence or absence of such species and critical habitat in the project area. Based on this review, USACE has made a preliminary determination that Federally-listed species and designated critical habitat are not present at the project location or in its vicinity, and that consultation will not be required. USACE will render a final determination on the need for consultation at the close of the comment period, taking into account any comments provided by USFWS and/or NMFS.

Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSFCMA): Section 305(b)(2) of the MSFCMA of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 1801 et seq.), requires Federal agencies to consult with the NMFS on all proposed actions authorized, funded, or undertaken by the agency that may adversely affect essential fish habitat (EFH). EFH is defined as those waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity. EFH is designated only for those species managed under a Federal Fisheries Management Plan (FMP), such as the Pacific Groundfish

FMP, the Coastal Pelagics FMP, and the Pacific Coast Salmon FMP. As the Federal lead agency for this project, USACE has conducted a review of digital maps prepared by NMFS depicting EFH to determine the presence or absence of EFH in the project area. Based on this review, USACE has made a preliminary determination that EFH is not present at the project location or in its vicinity, and that consultation will not be required. USACE will render a final determination on the need for consultation at the close of the comment period, taking into account any comments provided by NMFS.

Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (MPRSA): Section 302 of the MPRS of 1972, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 1432 et seq.), authorizes the Secretary of Commerce, in part, to designate areas of ocean waters, such as the Cordell Bank, Gulf of the Farallones, and Monterey Bay, as National Marine Sanctuaries for the purpose of preserving or restoring such areas for their conservation, recreational, ecological, or aesthetic values. After such designation, activities in sanctuary waters authorized under other authorities are valid only if the Secretary of Commerce certifies that the activities are consistent with Title III of the Act. No Department of the Army Permit will be issued until the applicant obtains the required certification or permit. The project does not occur in sanctuary waters, and a preliminary review by USACE indicates the project would not likely affect sanctuary resources. This presumption of effect, however, remains subject to a final determination by the Secretary of Commerce, or his designee.

National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA): Section 106 of the NHPA of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 470 et seq.), requires Federal agencies to consult with the appropriate State Historic Preservation Officer to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Section 106 of the Act further requires Federal agencies to consult with the appropriate Tribal Historic Preservation Officer or any Indian tribe to take into account the effects of their undertakings on properties, including traditional properties, trust resources, and sacred sites, to which Indian tribes attach historic, religious, and cultural As the Federal lead agency for this significance. undertaking, USACE has conducted a review of latest published version of the National Register of Historic Places, survey information on file with various city and county municipalities, and other information provided by the applicant, to determine the presence or absence of

historic and archaeological resources within the permit area. Based on this review, USACE has made a *preliminary* determination that historic or archaeological resources are not likely to be present in the permit area, and that the project either has no potential to cause effects to these resources or has no effect to these resources. USACE will render a final determination on the need for consultation at the close of the comment period, taking into account any comments provided by the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Tribal Historic Preservation, and Native American Nations or other tribal governments.

- 5. COMPLIANCE WITH THE SECTION 404(b)(1) GUIDELINES: Projects resulting in discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States must comply with the Guidelines promulgated by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency under Section 404(b) of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. § An evaluation pursuant to the Guidelines indicates the project is not dependent on location in or proximity to waters of the United States to achieve the basic project purpose. This conclusion raises the (rebuttable) presumption of the availability of a less environmentally damaging practicable alternative to the project that does not require the discharge of dredged or fill material into special aquatic sites. The applicant has submitted an analysis of project alternatives which is being reviewed by USACE.
- 6. PUBLIC INTEREST EVALUTION: The decision on whether to issue a Department of the Army Permit will be based on an evaluation of the probable impacts, including cumulative impacts, of the project and its intended use on the public interest. Evaluation of the probable impacts requires a careful weighing of the public interest factors relevant in each particular case. benefits that may accrue from the project must be balanced against any reasonably foreseeable detriments of project implementation. The decision on permit issuance will, therefore, reflect the national concern for both protection and utilization of important resources. Public interest factors which may be relevant to the decision process include conservation, economics, aesthetics, general environmental concerns, wetlands, cultural values, fish and wildlife values, flood hazards, floodplain values, land use, navigation, shore erosion and accretion, recreation, water supply and conservation, water quality, energy needs, safety, food and fiber production, mineral needs, considerations of property ownership, and, in general, the needs and welfare of the people.

- 7. CONSIDERATION OF COMMENTS: USACE is soliciting comments from the public; Federal, State and local agencies and officials; Native American Nations or other tribal governments; and other interested parties in order to consider and evaluate the impacts of the project. All comments received by USACE will be considered in the decision on whether to issue, modify, condition, or deny a Department of the Army Permit for the project. To make this decision, comments are used to assess impacts on endangered species, historic properties, water quality, and other environmental or public interest factors addressed in a final environmental assessment or environmental impact statement. Comments are also used to determine the need for a public hearing and to determine the overall public interest of the project.
- 8. **SUBMITTING COMMENTS**: During the specified comment period, interested parties may submit written comments to Bryan Matsumoto, San Francisco District, Regulatory Division, 1455 Market Street, 16th Floor, San Francisco, California 94103-1398; comment letters should cite the project name, applicant name, and public notice number to facilitate review by the Regulatory Permit Manager. Comments may include a request for a public hearing on the project prior to a determination on the Department of the Army permit application; such requests shall state, with particularity, the reasons for holding a All substantive comments will be public hearing. forwarded to the applicant for resolution or rebuttal. Additional project information or details on any subsequent project modifications of a minor nature may be obtained from the applicant and/or agent, or by contacting the Regulatory Permit Manager by telephone or e-mail cited in the public notice letterhead. An electronic version of this public notice may be viewed under the Public **Notices** tab the **USACE** website: http://www.spn.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory.