
Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board

TO: Jayne Powell, Chair
Edward Muzik, Vice-Chair
Nancy Wright, Board Member
Peter Satin, Board Member
Beatriz Gonzalez, Board Member
Vivian Perez, Board Member

FROM: Paula Rasmussen
Executive Officer
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Colorado River Basin Region

DATE: September 20, 2022

SUBJECT: MINOR, NON-SUBSTANTIVE CORRECTIONS TO THE LANGUAGE OF THE BASIN PLAN AMENDMENT TO REVISE THE SEPTIC TANK PROHIBITION FOR THE TOWN OF YUCCA VALLEY

On June 15, 2021, the Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board (Colorado River Basin Water Board) adopted Resolution No. R7-2021-0028, amending the Water Quality Control Plan for the Colorado River Basin Region (Basin Plan) to revise the septic tank prohibition for the town of Yucca Valley. The Resolution's resolved No. 5 states:

"If during the approval process, Colorado River Basin Water Board Staff, the State Water Board, or OAL determines that minor, non-substantive modifications to the language of the Amendment are needed for clarity or consistency, the Executive Officer may make such changes and shall inform the Colorado River Basin Water Board of any such changes."

This memorandum documents the changes and serves as a notification in accordance with the Resolution. Corrections identified by staff are listed below. The changes to the amendment will be made when it is incorporated into the Basin Plan, after the Office of Administrative Law reviews and approves the administrative record for the amendment. The page numbers are based on Attachment 1 of the Resolution; corrections made to the Amendment are shown in double underline and double strikeout.

- 1.) On page 5, section (a) Definitions, the following changes were made for accuracy and consistency in cross-referencing:
 6. Deferred parcels are parcels where the installation of a municipal sewage collection system is not economically or technically advisable,

JAYNE POWELL, CHAIR | PAULA RASMUSSEN, EXECUTIVE OFFICER

and is not required, until sufficient development occurs, as described in ~~sub~~section (e)(2).

- 2.) On page 10, in section (f)(2), second sentence, the following changes were made to correct a cross-reference:

Each report shall be organized in editable spreadsheet format and shall list all deferred parcels that have met any of the criteria specified in section (e)~~(2)~~(a).

- 3.) On page 12, section (g), numbered paragraph 3, the following changes were made for clarity and for consistency in cross-referencing:

Evidence that the connection to the municipal sewage collection system ~~public sewer~~ would be technically impracticable or economically excessively burdensome, such as:

- a. A map of the planned municipal sewage collection system layout demonstrating that the system will not be made available to the parcel, as defined in ~~sub~~sections (a)(2) and (a)(3); or
- b. A certification from HDWD that it will not make the municipal sewage collection system available to the parcel, as defined in ~~sub~~sections (a)(2) and (a)(3); or

- 4.) On page 12, section (g), numbered paragraph 4, the following changes were made for consistency in paragraph numbering styles and to update term “discharger” to “applicant” to be consistent with the provision that the application can be submitted by either the discharger or HDWD:

The Regional Water Board’s Executive Officer shall:

- ~~4.~~a. Within thirty (30) days from receipt of the application notify the ~~discharger~~applicant in writing whether the application is complete or request additional information as necessary; and
- ~~2.~~b. Verify the information and decide to approve or deny the exemption based on the provided evidence; and
- ~~3.~~c. Within (60) days of certifying that the application is complete, notify the discharger, HDWD, and the local agency implementing the OWTS Policy of the decision regarding the exemption status of the property in question.

Note that the use of the term “discharger” in the last sentence is still accurate because the discharger and HDWD should both be notified of the outcome, regardless of which party was the applicant.