

Phase 1 Report

Sunol Community Wastewater Feasibility Study

Prepared for:

Alameda County Department of Environmental Health 1131 Harbor Bay Parkway, Suite 250 Alameda, California 94502

Sunol Citizens' Advisory Council

By:

Questa Engineering Corporation

1220 Brickyard Cove Road, Suite 206 Point Richmond, California 94801

April 2021

Scope of Study

- □ Compile and review information on existing OWTS
- □ Soil and site suitability evaluation
- □ Sinbad Creek water quality sampling
- Formulate range of alternatives for long-term
 OWTS management
- Develop conceptual plans and preliminary cost estimates for community wastewater alternatives

Impetus for the Study

- Growing concerns about the condition and function of many aging OWTS
- Physical constraints for OWTS, including small lots, steep slopes, proximity to creeks
- OWTS regulatory challenges for home remodeling and additions
- Designated and Potential "Areas of Concern"

Field & Background Studies

□ County OWTS File Reviews

- **Questionnaire Survey**
- Individual Field Reviews
- Sinbad Creek water quality sampling
 Questa Engineering (June 2017, March 2018)
 Alameda Creek Alliance (February, May 2017)

Questionnaire Survey Results

- **Typically 2 buildings, 3 to 4 bedrooms, 2 occupants**
- □ Vast majority of OWTS 40+ years old
- < 20% have separate graywater system</p>
- 2 to 5-yr septic tank pump-out frequency (75%)
- 50% have had OWTS inspection, mostly downtown area, few in Kilkare Woods
- Vast majority report no OWTS problems
- Problems noted: sluggish plumbing, roots, access risers, tank replacement, leachfield replacement

Field Reviews

Subarea	Existing Development			Setback Variances; Tank, Field				Recommended OWTS	Disposal Site Rating	Upgrade Cost Rating
	Bldg. Size (Bedrooms)	Lot Size (acres)	Property Lines	Building, driveway	Cut Banks	Drainage Ditches	Watercourse		(A to E)	(1 to 3)
Downtown	3	5.08						Treatment or PD trenches	А	2
Downtown	2	0.14						Pump-up to standard trenches	A	2
Downtown	4	5.2	Tank, Field				Field	Treatment, w/subsurface drip	С	1
Lower Kilkare Rd	3	0.57	Field				Field	Treatment	С	2
Lower Kilkare Rd	4	1.2						Pump-up to standard trenches	A	2
Lower Kilkare Rd	3	0.44			Tank, Field	Field	Field	Treatment, w/subsurface drip	D	3
Kilkare West	1	0.14					Field***	Treatment, offsite adjacent PD trenches***	D	3
Kilkare West	1	0.12	Tank, Field	Field	Tank, Field			Off-site TBD	E	3
Kilkare West	3	0.72	Tank	Tank	Tank, Field		Tank, Field	Treatment w/subsurface drip	D	3
Kilkare West	2	0.35		Tank	Tank		Tank, Field	Treatment w/PD trenches	D	3
Kilkare West	2	0.11	Field	Tank, Field			Tank	Treatment, offsite adjacent PD trenches***	С	3
Kilkare West	2	0.12	Field	Tank, Field	Tank, Field	Tank, Field		Treatment w/subsurface drip	В	1
Kilkare East	2	0.38	Field	Tank	Tank, Field		Tank, Field	Treatment w/PD or subsurface drip	С	3
Kilkare East	3	0.3	Tank	Tank	Tank, Field		Field	Treatment w/subsurface drip	D	3

Beneficial Use	Fecal Coliform (MPN/100ml)	Total Coliform (MPN/100ml)	Enterococcus (MPN/100ml) ^g
Water Contact Recreation	geometric mean < 200 90th percentile < 400	median < 240 no sample > 10,000	geometric mean < 35 no sample > 104
Shellfish Harvesting ^b	median < 14 90th percentile < 43	median < 70 90th percentile < 230 ^c	
Non-contact Water Recreation ^d	mean < 2000 90th percentile < 4000		
Municipal Supply: - Surface Water ^e - Groundwater	geometric mean < 20	geometric mean < 100 $< 1.1^{f}$	

Table 6: Water Quality Objectives for Bacteria^a

Table 7: U.S. EPA Bacteriological Criteria for Water Contact Recreation¹ (in colonies per 100 ML)

	Fresh Water		Salt Water	
	Enterococci	E. Coli	Enterococci	
Steady State (all areas)	33	126	35	
Maximum at:				
- designated beach	61	235	104	
- moderately used area	89	298	124	
- lightly used area	108	406	276	
- infrequently used area	151	576	500	

Sinbad Creek - Fecal Bacteria Exceedances

Sampling Reach	Exceedances Questa Sampling	Exceedances ACA Sampling	Total Exceedances	Percent Exceedance
Upstream Control	0 of 3 samples	0 of 10 samples	0 of 13 samples	0%
Kilkare Woods	1 of 15 samples	2 of 20 samples	3 of 35 samples	9%
Lower Kilkare Rd	1 of 9 samples	3 of 20 samples	4 of 29 samples	14%
Downtown Sunol	3 of 9 samples	4 of 10 samples	7 of 19 samples	37%

Figure 6. Sinbad Creek Bacteriological Sampling Results Alameda Creek Alliance, E. coli Geometric Mean - May 2017

Questa Engineering, Fecal Coliform - 6/5/17 & 3/29/18



Figure 8. E. coli Trend vs. Cumulative Watershed Parcel Development

Alameda Creek Alliance Sampling Stations

Sinbad Creek - May 2017



Formulating Wastewater Alternatives

OWTS Options

- □ Status Quo individual responsibility for OWTS
- Onsite Management District Approach customized local standards; streamlined permitting; shared monitoring & maintenance; public financing opportunities

Community System Options

- □ Wastewater flow estimates for Sunol sub-areas
- □ Identify potential community wastewater sites
- □ Wastewater collection methods
- □ Wastewater treatment technologies
- □ Wastewater disposal site constraints & capacities

Wastewater Management Alternatives

- #1 No Project Status Quo
- #2 OWTS Management Program
- #3 Kilkare Woods Community System
- #4 Downtown Sunol Community System
- #5 Downtown-Lower Kilkare Rd Community System
- #6 Sunol Community-wide Wastewater System
- **#7** Sewer Connection to Pleasanton

Alternative #1 No Project/Status Quo

- Individual property owners responsible for cost of permitting, maintenance and repair of OWTS
- Permitting by ACDEH
- Variances common needed, involving costly and lengthy process
- Situations triggering OWTS upgrades, repairs and replacement :
 - Abatement of failed system or complaint
 - In connection with building improvements
 - Condition of sale at time of property transfer
 - Voluntary by property owner as needed

OWTS Upgrade-Repair Challenges

- Standard septic tank-leachfield options
 limited by small lots, steep slopes, stream and other setbacks
- Advanced treatment with pressure dosing leachfields/drip dispersal commonly needed
- Lengthy and costly variance approvals often required
- House additions and ADUs difficult to obtain

Alternative #1 – Estimated Numbers and Costs of OWTS Upgrades

OWTS Upgrade Category	Estimated Percentage of Total OWTS	Number of OWTS	Estimated Average Cost	Contingency 20%	Variance	Total Cost
Existing Code- Compliant OWTS	5%	12	0	0	0	0
Low Level of Upgrade	20%	49	\$18,000	\$3,600	\$5,000	\$26,600
Mid Level of Upgrade	25%	61	\$37,000	\$7,400	\$10,000	\$54,400
High Level of Upgrade	50%	121	\$64,000	\$12,800	\$15,000	\$91,800

Alternative #2 OWTS Management Program

- Adoption of customized local standards and procedures, such as:
 - Local geographic variances for streamlined approvals
 - >Application of innovative technologies
 - Credit for greywater systems and high efficiency water conserving fixtures
 - Streamlined site reviews, design and permitting process
 - > New site development, remodel and additions policies

Alternative #2 – Cont'd OWTS Management Program

- □ Community-based oversight, maintenance
 - & environmental monitoring
- Facilitate development of cluster OWTS and off-site easements
- Obtaining and facilitating public financing to support:
 - ➤OWTS management activities
 - Loans and grants to individual OWTS owners
 - Financing for construction of cluster systems

Alternative #2 – Estimated Numbers and Costs of OWTS Upgrades under Management District

OWTS Upgrade Category	Estimated Percentage of Total OWTS	Number of OWTS	Estimated Average Cost	Total Cost	
Existing Code-Compliant OWTS	5%	12	0	0	
Low Level of Upgrade	20%	49	\$18,000	\$900,000	
Mid Level of Upgrade	25%	61	\$37,000	\$2,257,000	
High Level of Upgrade	50%	121	\$64,000	\$7,744,000	
Total	100%	244		\$10,901,000	
Average Estimated Cost per Parcel (for 244 parcels)					

Estimated Community Wastewater Flows

l and lleo	# of	Unit Flow	Level of Residential Participation		
	Parcels	(gpd)*	100%	75%	50%
Downtown Sunol		• • • •		-	-
Residential	60	125	7,500	5,625	3,750
Multi-Family	3	500	1,500	1,500	1,500
Commercial & Industrial	8	-	4,500	4,500	4,500
School	1	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
Railroad (Restroom)	1	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Dow	ntown Sun	ol Sub-total	16,000	14,125	12,250
Lower Kilkare Road				_	-
Residential	68	125	8,500	6,375	4,250
Commercial	1	500	500	500	500
Lower	Kilkare Roa	ad Sub-total	9,000	6,875	4,750
Kilkare Woods					
Residential	102	125	12,750	9,625	6,375
KWA Clubhouse	1	50	50	50	50
K	ds Sub-total	12,800	9,675	6,425	
	y Area Total	37,800	30,675	23,425	

*gpd stands for gallons per day





Preliminary Cost Estimate Kilkare Woods - Alternative 3 (A, B & C)

	Level of Residential Participation			
Item	3A - 100%	3B - 75%	3C - 50%	
Total Parcels (ESDs)*	103	78	52	
Public Facilities Cost	\$2,476,000	\$2,280,800	\$2,070,400	
On-lot Facilities Cost	\$1,876,200	\$1,421,400	\$951,600	
Total Estimated Cost	\$4,352,200	\$3,702,200	\$3,022,000	
Estimated Cost per Parcel (ESD)	\$42,254	\$47,464	\$58,115	
Approximate Homeowner Cost for On-lot Work	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	
Net Cost to Assessment per Parcel (ESD)	\$37,254	\$42,464	\$53,115	
Annual Cost per Parcel (assume 20-years at 3%)	\$2,504	\$2,854	\$3,570	

*"ESD" stands for equivalent single family dwelling



12,000 ft² area for treatment leachfields or drip dispersal

16,000 ft² area for treatment, leachfields or drip dispersal (existing Cerny Bldg. leachfield)

4,000 ft² area for treatment or drip dispersal

10,000 ft² area for subsurface drip dispersal/irrigation Bond St Service Yard

Setback distance to top of creek bank

Sinbad Creek

Depot Gardens



Aternative #4 Downtown Sunol Community Wastewater System

Preliminary Cost Estimate Downtown Sunol - Alternative 4 (A, B & C)

ltem	Level of Residential Participation			
iteini	4A - 100%	4B - 75%	4C - 50%	
Total Parcels	73	58	43	
Residential Parcels	60	45	30	
Multi-family and Non-residential Parcels	13	13	13	
Multi-family and Non-residential ESDs	39	39	39	
Total Estimated ESDs	99	84	69	
Public Facilities Cost	\$2,133,600	\$1,960,800	\$1,768,000	
On-lot Facilities Cost	\$1,705,800	\$1,372,800	\$1,039,800	
Total Estimated Cost	\$3,839,400	\$3,333,600	\$2,807,800	
Estimated Cost per Residence (ESD)	\$38,782	\$39,686	\$40,693	
Approximate Homeowner Cost for On-lot Work	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	
Net Cost to Assessment per Parcel (ESD)	\$33,782	\$34,686	\$35,693	
Estimated Annual Cost per Parcel (ESD) (assume 20 years at 3% interest)	\$2,270	\$2,331	\$2,400	



Alternative #5 Downtown Sunol & Lower Kilkare Road Community Wastewater System

Preliminary Cost Estimate Downtown & Lower Kilkare Rd - Alternative 5 (A, B & C)

ltem	Level of Residential Participation			
Rem	5A - 100%	5B - 75%	5C - 50%	
Total Parcels	142	110	78	
Residential Parcels	128	96	64	
Multi-family and Non-residential Parcels	14	14	14	
Multi-family and Non-residential ESDs	42	42	42	
Total Estimated ESDs	170	138	106	
Public Facilities Cost	\$4,378,400	\$4,050,400	\$3,660,800	
On-lot Facilities Cost	\$3,024,000	\$2,379,000	\$1,725,000	
Total Estimated Cost	\$7,402,400	\$6,429,400	\$5,385,800	
Estimated Cost per Residence (ESD)	\$43,544	\$46,590	\$50,809	
Approximate Homeowner Cost for On-lot Work	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	
Net Cost to Assessment per Parcel (ESD)	\$38,544	\$41,590	\$45,809	
Estimated Annual Cost per Parcel (ESD) (assume 20 years at 3% interest)	\$2,590	\$2,796	\$3,080	

4" Dia. STEG/STEP sewer extension on Kilkare Rd to upper end of Kilkare Woods

> 3" dia. STEP sewers; each parcel has its own spetic tank

> > and pump unit or gravity

connection to main

Secondary treatment at Depot Gardens (east side) or Bond St Service Yard

Subsurface drip dispersal areas

DEPOT GARDENS

Primary leachfield and part of reserve

BOND ST

Future 2,000-ft long effluent transmission line from treatment plant to reserve leachfield NILES CANYON RAILWAY STATION

APPROX. SCALE: 1" = 350'

PHASE 1 – SUNOL WASTEWATER FEASIBILITY STUDY

Additional future leachfield area to meet 100% reserve requirement (not built)

SUNOL, CALIFORNIA ALAMEDA COUNTY



ALTERNATIVE 6 SUNOL COMMUNITY-WIDE WASTEWATER SYSTEM FIGURE

18

Preliminary Cost Estimate Sunol Community-wide - Alternative 6 (A, B & C)

ltem	Level of Residential Participation			
iteini	6A - 100%	6B - 75%	6C - 50%	
Total Parcels	245	187	130	
Residential Parcels	231	174	116	
Multi-family and Non-residential Parcels	14	14	14	
Multi-family and Non-residential ESDs	42	42	42	
Total Estimated ESDs	273	216	158	
Public Facilities Cost	\$7,188,000	\$6,572,000	\$5,837,600	
On-lot Facilities Cost	\$4,837,800	\$3,732,900	\$2,610,600	
Total Estimated Cost	\$12,025,800	\$10,304,900	\$8,448,200	
Estimated Cost per Residence (ESD)	\$44,051	\$47,708	\$53,470	
Approximate Homeowner Cost for On-lot Work	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	
Net Cost to Assessment per Parcel (ESD)	\$39,051	\$42,708	\$48,470	
Estimated Annual Cost per Parcel (ESD) (assume 20 years at 3% interest)	\$2,625	\$2,870	\$3,258	



Preliminary Cost Estimate Sewer Connection to Pleasanton – Alternative 7

ltem	Estimated Cost
Public sewer facilities cost:	\$ 16,177,600
On-lot facilities connection cost:	\$ 3,119,400
Total estimated construction cost:	\$ 19,297,000
Construction cost per residence (273 ESDs):	\$ 70,945
City of Pleasanton connection fee per residence:	\$ 14,885
Total estimated cost per connection:	\$ 85,830
Up-front homeowner costs for connection:	\$ 27,000
Net Cost to Assessment per Parcel (ESD):	\$ 58,830
Estimated Annual Cost per Parcel (ESD): (assume 20 years at 3% interest)	\$ 3,934

Preliminary Cost Summary

Alternative	# Parcels Served	Estimated Project Cost	Estimated Cost per ESD	Estimated Amortized Cost
#1 – No Project, Status Quo	244	N/A	\$27,000 to \$92,000+	N/A
#2 – Onsite Management District	244	\$10,883,000	\$18,000 to \$64,000	Possible Financing
#3 – Kilkare Woods System	103	\$4,352,200	\$42,254	\$2,504
#4 – Downtown Sunol System	73	\$3,839,400	\$ 38,782	\$2,270
#5 – Downtown & Lower Kilkare Rd	142	\$7,402,400	\$43,544	\$2,590
#6 – Sunol Community-wide System	245	\$ 12,025,800	\$44,051	\$2,625
# 7 – Sewer Connection to Pleasanton	245	\$ 19,297,000	\$ 85,830	\$ 3,934

Next Steps

- **Review and discuss** information in the report
- **Community surveys** on level of interest,
 - preferences, additional information needs, etc.
- □ Talk to or visit other similar communities
- **Define potential service areas**
- **Define scope of additional studies**
- **Gamma** Funding sources
- **D** Phase 2 Feasiblity Study, if warranted

SEPA

It's Your Choice

A Guidebook for Local Officials on Small Community Wastewater Management Options



