



California Regional Water Quality Control Board

Los Angeles Region



Linda S. Adams
Agency Secretary

320 W. 4th Street, Suite 200, Los Angeles, California 90013
Phone (213) 576-6600 FAX (213) 576-6640 - Internet Address: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles>

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) REQUIREMENTS

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region (Regional Board) is the Lead Agency for evaluating the environmental impacts of the proposed amendment to the *Water Quality Control Plan - Los Angeles Region* (Basin Plan). The proposed amendment will update the bacteria objectives for freshwaters designated for water contact recreation (REC-1) by removing the fecal coliform objectives.

The Secretary of Resources has certified the State and Regional Boards' basin planning process as exempt from certain requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including preparation of an initial study, negative declaration, and environmental impact report (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15251(g)). As the proposed amendment to the Basin Plan is part of the basin planning process, the environmental information developed for and included with the amendment is considered a substitute to an initial study, negative declaration, and/or environmental impact report.

The "certified regulatory program" of the Regional Board, however, must satisfy the substantive requirements of California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Section 3777(a), which requires a written report that includes a description of the proposed activity, an alternatives analysis, and an identification of mitigation measures to minimize any significant adverse impacts. Section 3777(a) also requires the Regional Board to complete an environmental checklist as part of its substitute environmental documents.

The Regional Board's substantive obligations when adopting Basin Plan amendments are described in Public Resources Code section 21159. Section 21159, which allows expedited environmental review for mandated projects, provides that an agency shall perform, at the time of the adoption of a rule or regulation requiring the installation of pollution control equipment, or a performance standard or treatment requirement, an Environmental Analysis of the reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance.

The statute further requires that the environmental analysis at a minimum, include, all of the following:

- (1) An analysis of the reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts of the methods of compliance.
- (2) An analysis of reasonably foreseeable mitigation measures to lessen the adverse environmental impacts.
- (3) An analysis of reasonably foreseeable alternative means of compliance with the rule or regulation that would have less significant adverse impacts. (Pub. Res. Code § 21159(a).)

Section 21159(c) requires that the Environmental Analysis take into account a reasonable range of:

- (1) Environmental, economic, and technical factors,

California Environmental Protection Agency



Our mission is to preserve and enhance the quality of California's water resources for the benefit of present and future generations.

- (2) Population and geographic areas, and
- (3) Specific sites.

A “reasonable range” does not require an examination of every site, but a reasonably representative sample of them. The statute specifically states that the section shall not require the agency to conduct a “project level analysis.” (Pub. Res. Code § 21159(d).) Rather, a project level analysis must be performed by the local agencies that are required to implement the requirements of the rule or regulation (i.e. Basin Plan amendment). (Pub. Res. Code § 21159.2.) Notably, the Regional Board is prohibited from specifying the manner of compliance with its regulations (Cal. Water Code § 13360), and accordingly, the actual environmental impacts will necessarily depend upon the compliance strategy selected by the local agencies and other permittees.

The attached checklist and the technical report entitled “Proposed Amendment to the *Water Quality Control Plan - Los Angeles Region* to Update the Bacteria Objectives for Freshwaters Designated for Water Contact Recreation by Removing the Fecal Coliform Objective,” with the responses to comments, and the resolution approving the amendment fulfill the requirements of 23 Cal. Code Regs. §3777, Subdivision (a), and the Regional Board’s substantive CEQA obligations. In preparing these CEQA substitute documents, the Regional Board has considered the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21159 and California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 15187, and intends these documents to serve as a tier 1 environmental review.

I. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTIVITY

The proposed activity is a Basin Plan amendment to update the freshwater bacteria objectives in the Basin Plan to maintain consistency with EPA’s recommendation that *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*) replace fecal coliform as an indicator of the presence of pathogens in fresh waters used for water contact recreation, and removes unnecessary regulatory and monitoring requirements that arise from having objectives for both indicators.

In 1986, the U.S. EPA published revised ambient water quality criteria for bacteria, recommending that states use enterococcus in marine water and *E. coli* or enterococcus in fresh water (U.S. EPA, *Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Bacteria - 1986*). These criteria were based on epidemiological studies conducted in 1983 and 1984 to determine the most appropriate bacterial indicators and corresponding objectives for waters designated for water contact recreation. Following this, in March 1999, U.S. EPA made a commitment in its *Action Plan for Beaches and Recreational Waters* that “where a State does not amend its water quality standards to include the 1986 criteria, EPA will act under Section 303(c) of the Clean Water Act to promulgate the criteria with the goal of assuring that the 1986 criteria apply in all states no later than 2003.” In response, the Regional Board updated its bacteria objectives in 2001 to incorporate both EPA’s recommended criteria, and those specified by Assembly Bill 411 (1997), as codified in California Code of Regulations, Title 17, section 7958.

While EPA recommended the use of *E. coli* in place of fecal coliform, the Regional Board did not immediately remove the fecal coliform objectives during the 2001 update of its bacteria

objectives. Rather, it allowed a transition period for incorporation of *E. coli* objectives into permits and water quality monitoring programs, and for collection of data on the new objective to establish an adequate monitoring database. EPA sanctions such transition periods but recommends a single triennial review cycle as the duration of the transition period. This is the third triennial review cycle since the adoption of the 2001 bacteria objectives.

The Regional Board's goal in updating the region's fresh water bacteria objectives is to maintain consistency with EPA's recommendation that *E. coli* replace fecal coliform as the indicator of the presence of pathogens in fresh waters used for water contact recreation, and to remove unnecessary regulatory and monitoring requirements that arise from having objectives for both indicators. This action will result in having *E. coli* as the sole bacterial indicator to assess and regulate the quality of fresh waters used for water contact recreation (REC-1) in the Los Angeles Region.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND BASELINE CONDITIONS

Since this action involves the removal of a redundant objective, it does not impose any new requirements on the regulated community. Therefore no implementation actions are associated with the action. However, the Regional Board considered potential environmental impacts arising from the removal of the fecal coliform indicator from the freshwater bacteria objectives (Pub. Res. Code § 21159). As discussed in the staff report, *E. coli* is a subset of fecal coliform bacteria, and has been determined to be a better indicator of public health risk than fecal coliforms based on national epidemiological studies conducted by the U.S. EPA. In determining the *E. coli* objective, EPA used the same "acceptable illness rate" used to develop the current fecal coliform objective, therefore there is no increased risk of illness related to REC-1 activities associated with the proposed revision to the freshwater bacteria objectives to remove the fecal coliform objectives, but retain the *E. coli* objectives.

The proposed amendment to remove the fecal coliform bacteria indicator from the fresh water bacteria objectives will relieve affected parties such as responsible jurisdictions identified in TMDLs and permittees of redundant regulatory and associated monitoring requirements.

The environmental setting and authority for the proposed amendment to update the freshwater bacteria objectives for waters designated for water contact recreation are set forth in the accompanying staff report. The report titled "Proposed Amendment to the *Water Quality Control Plan - Los Angeles Region* to Update the Bacteria Objectives for Freshwaters Designated for Water Contact Recreation by Removing the Fecal Coliform Objective" (April 2010)," discusses the environmental setting and need for the project.

Environmental Impacts

III.	ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
1.	Earth. Will the proposal result in:				
	a. Unstable earth conditions or in changes in geologic substructures?				X
	b. Disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcoming of the soil?				X
	c. Change in topography or ground surface relief features?				X
	d. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?				X
	e. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?				X
	f. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sands, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of the ocean or any bay, inlet or lake?				X
	g. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards, such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?				X
2.	Air. Will the proposal result in:				
	a. Substantial air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality?				X
	b. The creation of objectionable odors?				X
	c. Alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?				X

III.	ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
3.	Water. Will the proposal result in:				
	a. Changes in currents, or the course of direction or water movements, in either marine or fresh waters?				X
	b. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface water runoff?				X
	c. Alterations to the course of flow of flood waters?				X
	d. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?				X
	e. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity?				X
	f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground waters?				X
	g. Change in the quantity or quality of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?				X
	h. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?				X
	i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding or tidal waves?				X
4.	Plant Life. Will the proposal result in:				
	a. Change in the diversity of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, microflora and aquatic plants)?				X
	b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?				X

III.	ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
	c. Introduction of new species of plants into an area, or in a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?				X
	d. Reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop?				X
5.	Animal Life. Will the proposal result in:				
	a. Change in the diversity of species, or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms, insects or microfauna)?				X
	b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?				X
	c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?				X
	d. Deterioration to existing fish or wildlife habitat?				X
6.	Noise. Will the proposal result in:				
	a. Increases in existing noise levels?				X
	b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?				X
7.	Light and Glare. Will the proposal:				
	a. Produce new light or glare?				X
8.	Land Use. Will the proposal result in:				
	a. Substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?				X
9.	Natural Resources. Will the proposal result in:				
	a. Increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?				X
	b. Substantial depletion of any nonrenewable natural resource?				X

III.	ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
10.	Risk of Upset. Will the proposal involve:				
	a. A risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions?				X
11.	Population. Will the proposal:				
	a. Alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area?				X
12.	Housing. Will the proposal:				
	a. Affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?				X
13.	Transportation/Circulation. Will the proposal result in:				
	a. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement?				X
	b. Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?				X
	c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems?				X
	d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?				X
	e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?				X
	f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians?				X
14.	Public Service. Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:				
	a. Fire protection?				X
	b. Police protection?				X

III.	ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
	c. Schools?				X
	d. Parks or other recreational facilities?				X
	e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?				X
	f. Other governmental services?				X
15.	Energy. Will the proposal result in:				
	a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?				X
	b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?				X
16.	Utilities and Service Systems. Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:				
	a. Power or natural gas?				X
	b. Communications systems?				X
	c. Water?				X
	d. Sewer or septic tanks?				X
	e. Storm water drainage?				X
	f. Solid waste and disposal?				X
17.	Human Health. Will the proposal result in:				
	a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?				X
	b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?				X
18.	Aesthetics. Will the proposal result in:				
	a. The obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public?				X

III.	ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
	b. The creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?				X
19.	Recreation. Will the proposal result in:				
	a. Impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?				X
20.	Archeological/Historical. Will the proposal:				
	a. Result in the alteration of a significant archeological or historical site structure, object or building?				X
21.	Mandatory Findings of Significance				
	Potential to degrade: Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
	Short-term: Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time, while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)				X
	Cumulative: Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environment is significant.)				X
	Substantial adverse: Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

IV. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

1. Earth. a. Will the proposal result in unstable earth conditions or in changes in geologic substructures?

Answer: No impact.

No impact is expected because the proposed amendment does not require any actions that could result in disruptions to earth.

1. Earth. b. Will the proposal result in disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcoming of the soil?

Answer: No impact.

No impact is expected because the proposed amendment does not require any actions that could result in disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcoming of the soil.

1. Earth. c. Will the proposal result in change in topography or ground surface relief features?

Answer: No impact.

No impact is expected because the proposed amendment does not require any actions that could result in changes in topography or ground surface relief features.

1. Earth d. Will the proposal result in the destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?

Answer: No impact.

No impact is expected because the proposed amendment does not require any actions that could result in destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features.

1. Earth. e. Will the proposal result in any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?

Answer: No impact.

No impact is expected because the proposed amendment does not require any actions that could result in building anything on the surface of the land that will alter wind patterns, nor does it result in any disruptions to the earth that would lead to increased erosion of soils.

IV. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (continued)

1. Earth. f. Will the proposal result in changes in deposition or erosion of beach sands, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of the ocean or any bay, inlet or lake?

Answer: No impact.

No impact is expected because the proposed amendment does not require any actions that could result in deposition or erosion of beach sands, or changes that could modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of the ocean or any bay, inlet or lake.

1. Earth. g. Will the proposal result in exposure of people or property to geologic hazards, such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?

Answer: No impact.

No impact is expected because the proposed amendment does not require any actions that could result in exposure of people or property to geologic hazards, such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards.

2. Air. a. Will the proposal result in substantial air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in the construction of any mechanical devices that are pollution generating. It will also not result in increased population centers that would lead to increased automobile traffic.

2. Air. b. Will the proposal result in creation of objectionable odors?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in the in creation of objectionable odors.

2. Air. c. Will the proposal result in alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally.

IV. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (continued)

3. Water. a. Will the proposal result in changes in currents, or the course of direction or water movements, in either marine or fresh waters?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions or require the construction of any structures in or above the water that would result in alterations of the currents, or the course of direction of the water.

3. Water. b. Will the proposal result in changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface water runoff?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions or require the construction of any structures in or above the water that would result in alteration of the absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff. In addition, the proposed amendment will not require that water entering the system be treated differently than it has prior to this amendment; e.g., additional treatment, diversion, etc.

3. Water. c. Will the proposal result in alterations to the course of flow of flood waters?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions or require the construction of any structures in or above the water that would result in alterations to the course of flow of flood waters. In addition, the proposed amendment will not require that water entering the system be treated differently than it has prior to this amendment; e.g., additional treatment, diversion, etc.

3. Water. d. Will the proposal result in change in the amount of surface water in any water body?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in a change in the amount of surface water in any water body.

3. Water. e. Will the proposal result in discharge to surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity?

Answer: No impact

No impact is expected because the proposed amendment does not require any actions that could result in discharge to surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity.

3. Water. f. Will the proposal result in alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground waters?

IV. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (continued)

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground waters. The proposed amendment will not require that water entering the system be treated differently than it has prior to this amendment; e.g., additional treatment, diversion, etc.

3. Water. g. Will the proposal result in change in the quantity or quality of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in the construction of any structures in or above the water that will change the quantity or quality of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations. In addition, it will not require that water entering the system be treated differently than it has prior to this amendment; e.g., additional treatment, diversion, etc.

3. Water. h. Will the proposal result in substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies.

3. Water. i. Will the proposal result in exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding or tidal waves?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding or tidal waves.

4. Plant Life. a. Will the proposal result in change in the diversity of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, microflora and aquatic plants)?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in change in the diversity of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, microflora and aquatic plants).

IV. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (continued)

4. Plant life. b. Will the proposal result in reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants.

4. Plant life. c. Will the proposal result in introduction of new species of plants into an area, or in a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in introduction of new species of plants into an area, or in a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species.

4. Plant life. d. Will the proposal result in reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not result in reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop.

5. Animal Life. a. Will the proposal result in change in the diversity of species, or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms, insects or microfauna)?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in change in the diversity of species, or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms, insects or microfauna).

5. Animal Life. b. Will the proposal result in reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals.

5. Animal Life. c. Will the proposal result in introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?

IV. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (continued)

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals.

5. Animal Life. d. Will the proposal result in deterioration to existing fish or wildlife habitat?

Answer: No impact

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat.

6. Noise. a. Will the proposal result in increases in existing noise levels?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in the development or increase in any devices that would increase existing noise levels, either natural or anthropogenic.

6. Noise. b. Will the proposal result in exposure of people to severe noise levels?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in the development or increase in any devices that would result in exposure of people to severe noise levels, either natural or anthropogenic.

7. Light and Glare. Will the proposal produce new light or glare?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in the development or increase in any devices that would produce new light or glare, either natural or anthropogenic.

8. Land Use. a. Will the proposal result in substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in water quality changes that would lead to a change in land use patterns. The amendment continues to support the same designated beneficial uses.

IV. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (continued)

9. Natural Resources. a. Will the proposal result in increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in increase in the rate of use of any natural resources.

9. Natural Resources. a. Will the proposal result in substantial depletion of any nonrenewable natural resource?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in depletion of any nonrenewable natural resource.

10. Risk of Upset. a. Will the proposal involve a risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in the development or increase in any devices that would lead to an increased risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances.

11. Population. a. Will the proposal alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in alterations to the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area.

12. Housing. a. Will the proposal affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing.

IV. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (continued)

13. Transportation/Circulation. a. Will the proposal result in generation of substantial additional vehicular movement?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not result in generation of substantial additional vehicular movement nor lead to a change in land use patterns that would lead to a change in transportation or circulation.

13. Transportation/Circulation. b. Will the proposal result in effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would have an effect on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking.

13. Transportation/Circulation. c. Will the proposal result in substantial impact upon existing transportation systems?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in impact upon existing transportation systems.

13. Transportation/Circulation. d. Will the proposal result in alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods nor change in land use patterns that would lead to a change in circulation or movement.

13. Transportation/Circulation. e. Will the proposal result in alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic.

IV. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (continued)

13. Transportation/Circulation. f. Will the proposal result in increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians.

14. Public Service. a. Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas: Fire protection?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered fire protection.

14. Public Service. b. Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas: Police protection?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered police protection.

14. Public Service. c. Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas: Schools?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered schools.

14. Public Service. d. Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas: Parks or other recreational facilities?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered parks.

14. Public Service. e. Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas: maintenance of public facilities, including roads?

Answer: No impact.

IV. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (continued)

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered public facilities, including roads.

14. Public Service. f. Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas: other government services?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would have an effect upon, or result in a need for any new or altered other government services.

15. Energy. a. Will the proposal result in use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in the development or increase in any devices that would increase fuel or energy consumption.

15. Energy. b. Will the proposal result in a substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in the development of new devices that would increase demand upon existing sources of energy, or that would require the development of new sources of energy.

16. Utilities and Service Systems. a. Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities: power or natural gas?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in a need for new systems, or substantially alter power or natural gas utilities.

16. Utilities and Service Systems. b. Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities: communications systems?

Answer: No impact.

IV. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (continued)

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in a need for new communication systems, or substantially alter communication systems.

16. Utilities and Service Systems. c. Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities: water?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in a need for new water systems, or substantially alter water systems.

16. Utilities and Service Systems. d. Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities: Sewer or septic tanks?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in a need for new, or substantial alterations to, sewers or septic tanks or that would lead to a change in land use patterns that would lead to a change in demand for sewers or septic tanks.

16. Utilities and Service Systems. e. Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities: storm water drainage?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in a need for new, or substantial alterations to, storm water drainage systems or that would lead to a change in land use patterns that would lead to a change in stormwater drainage.

16. Utilities and Service Systems. f. Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities: solid waste and disposal?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in a need for new, or substantial alterations to, solid waste disposal or that would lead to a change in land use patterns that would lead to a change in demand for solid waste disposal.

17. Human Health. a. Will the proposal result in creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?

Answer: No impact.

IV. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (continued)

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would create any health hazard or potential health hazard. Additionally, the proposal will not create any health hazard or potential health hazard because the *E. coli* objective that is to remain as the sole bacterial indicator for freshwaters designated for water contact recreation was developed based on the same “acceptable” illness rate as the fecal coliform objective, which it replaces.

17. Human Health. b. Will the proposal result in exposure of people to potential health hazards?

Answer: No impact.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would expose people to potential health hazards. Additionally, the proposal will not result in exposure of people to potential health hazards because the *E. coli* objective that is to remain as the sole bacterial indicator for freshwaters designated for water contact recreation was developed based on the same “acceptable” illness rate as the fecal coliform objective, which it replaces.

18. Aesthetics. a. Will the proposal result in the obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public?

Answer: No impact.

No impact is expected because the proposed amendment does not require any actions that would result in building anything on the surface of the land that would obstruct any scenic vista or view open to the public.

18. Aesthetics. b. Will the proposal result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?

Answer: No impact.

No impact is expected because the proposed amendment does not require any actions that would result in building anything on the surface of the land that would create an aesthetically offensive site open to public view.

19. Recreation. a. Will the proposal result in impact on the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?

Answer: No impact.

Implementation of the proposed amendment will have no negative impact on the quality and quantity of recreational opportunities because the *E. coli* objective that is to remain as the sole bacterial indicator for

IV. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (continued)

freshwaters designated for water contact recreation was developed based on the same “acceptable” illness rate as the fecal coliform objective, which it replaces.

20. Archeological/Historical. a. Will the proposal result in the alteration of a significant archeological or historical site structure, object or building?

Answer: No impact.

Implementation of the proposed amendment is unlikely to impact a significant archeological or historical site structure, object or building because the proposed amendment does not require the construction or alteration of anything on land or water.

21. Mandatory Findings of Significance.

Potential to degrade: Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Answer: No impact

The goals of this amendment are to update the freshwater bacteria objectives in the Basin plan to maintain consistency with EPA’s recommendation that *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*) replace fecal coliform as an indicator of the presence of pathogens in fresh waters used for water contact recreation, and remove unnecessary regulatory and monitoring requirements that arise from having water quality objectives for both indicators. There are no implementation actions associated with this action, and therefore no potential for adverse impacts on the environment. This amendment will have no impact on public health risk since the *E. coli* objective that is to remain as the sole bacterial indicator for freshwaters designated for water contact recreation was developed based on the same “acceptable” illness rate as the fecal coliform objective, which it replaces.

Short-term: Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one that occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time, while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)

Answer: No impact.

There are no short term impacts associated with this action.

IV. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (continued)

Cumulative: Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?
(A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environment is significant.)

Answer: No impact.

There are no individual or cumulative impacts associated with this action.

Substantial adverse: Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Answer: No impact

The project maintains the existing level of protection of water quality in the Los Angeles Region and does not require any actions that would result in adverse effects on human beings.



V. PRELIMINARY STAFF DETERMINATION

Updating the bacteria objectives for fresh waters designated for water contact recreation will maintain consistency with EPA’s recommendation regarding fresh water bacteria criteria, and will remove the redundancy that exists by having both fecal coliform and *E. coli* indicators as water quality objectives for freshwaters designated as REC-1. There are no adverse impacts associated with this action.

On the basis of the substitute environmental documents for the update of the fresh water bacteria objectives, which collectively provide the required information I find that:

- The proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and, therefore, no alternatives or mitigation measures are proposed.
- The proposed project **MAY** have a significant or potentially significant effect on the environment, and therefore alternatives and mitigation measures have been evaluated.

_____	_____
Signature	Date
_____	_____
Printed Name	For