

THE PROJECT**1. PROJECT TITLE:**

Amendment of the Water Quality Control Plan for Enclosed Bays and Estuaries – Part 1 Sediment Quality for the protection of Fish and Wildlife

2. LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS:

State Water Resources Control Board – Division of Water Quality
1001 I Street Sacramento California 95814

3. CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER:

Mr. Chris Beegan 916.341.5577
Mr. Dominic Gregorio 916.341.5488

4. PROJECT LOCATION:

Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California as defined in Water Code Section 13391.5

5. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT:

Amend the Water Quality Control Plan for Enclosed Bays and Estuaries – Part 1 Sediment Quality (Part 1). The proposed amendments consist of the following:

- A proposed narrative sediment quality objective that protects resident finfish and wildlife from detrimental effects caused by exposure to pollutants in sediment
- A proposed process for implementing this narrative objective
- Proposed definitions to the glossary in support of the narrative objective described above
- Corrections to a variable defined in Equation 2 of Part 1
- Corrections to DDD, DDE and DDT values applied to the CSI chemical index score contained in Table 7 of Part 1
- Corrections to the list of chemicals described in Attachment A of Part 1

Proposed Amendments to Part 1 are presented in ~~strikeout~~ underline in Appendix XX

No cumulative adverse environmental impacts are expected to result from the adoption of the proposed amendments at the program level. At the project level, the lead agency will have to analyze whether a compliance project could have environmentally cumulative effects. This analysis will depend on whether other related or unrelated projects are occurring in the same general time and space as the compliance project. Whether or not any potential significant adverse cumulative impacts could occur at the project level will depend on site-specific information related to the location, timing, and nature of the compliance action. The proposed amendments do not mandate any actions or projects that would lead to significant, permanent, or negative impacts on the environment. However, this analysis also considers the reasonably foreseeable potential adverse environmental impacts

stemming from the reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance with Part I, including additional controls or remediation, or the development of TMDLs. Staff anticipates that all reasonably foreseeable potential environmental impacts will be reduced to less-than-significant by complying with the Water Boards' plans, policies, and permit conditions, appropriate mitigation measures, and any other applicable laws of other agencies.

CEQA Checklist
Proposed Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for Enclosed Bays and Estuaries

Part 1 Sediment Quality for the Protection of Fish and Wildlife

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS				
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Failure to meet the objectives could potentially result in construction activities for additional treatment works, BMPs, and use of land or vessel-based heavy equipment for all projects involving dredging or construction activities. Thus, reasonably foreseeable short-term impacts could occur during construction-related activities. No long-term impacts are anticipated that would result in substantial physical changes to the environment, including light or glare that would affect aesthetics. Construction activities could be limited to spring, fall, and winter weekdays to avoid disrupting recreational, pleasure boating or site-seeing activities associated with the summer tourist season. Appropriate mitigation measures for individual projects would depend upon the type of project activity, and duration. Mitigation of potential impacts to aesthetics will be considered under CEQA for each specific project.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Boards. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed amendments will not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses nor are the proposed amendments expected to conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. Section VII.7.E of Part 1 provides the Regional Boards with discretion to determine how the SQOs will be implemented within the irrigated lands program. The proposed amendments do not alter the Regional Boards discretionary authority within the irrigated lands program.

III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance could include construction activities for treatment works, BMPs, and/or removal actions using land or vessel-based heavy equipment for all projects involving dredging or construction activities. Emissions from equipment, vehicles, and vessels have the potential for temporary adverse effects to air quality. The primary pollutants of concern in these emissions are NOx or nitrogen oxides. NOx are precursors to ozone formation, and many of the major embayments and the Sacramento San Joaquin Delta are located in areas designated as nonattainment areas for ozone. Other emissions of concern could be carbon monoxide and PM₁₀ (particulate matter < 10 microns). In order to evaluate the air quality impact of emissions due to dredging, disposal, and capping equipment, or other actions, the project proponent must identify the specific type of equipment that will be used in the remediation action. Emissions from the equipment must be quantified and evaluated in the context of local or regional significance thresholds established by the appropriate Air Quality Management Districts where the project is located. Emissions that exceed the thresholds must be mitigated. Potential air quality impacts can be mitigated by using more modern and efficient equipment that produces lower emissions, operating equipment under a permit, use of electric dredging equipment, and planning the project for the time of year or day when emissions would be least likely to cause an exceedance of air quality standards. Other mitigation measures could include optimizing the mode of transportation, favoring disposal sites closer to dredge sites, and minimizing the number of trips necessary to transport dredged material to the disposal site or rehandling facility, covering loads with plastic sheeting and wetting dry materials to minimize dust. If volatile compounds are present in excavated materials, additional controls may be required by the local Air Quality Management District. Mitigation of air quality impacts will be considered under CEQA for each specific project relative to the thresholds established by the appropriate Air Quality Management District. These potentially significant impacts can be reduced to

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

less than significant with mitigation measures.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Although a goal of the proposed amendments is to improve sediment quality to better protect finfish and wildlife-related beneficial uses, the reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance could include construction activities for treatment works, BMPs, and/or removal actions using land or vessel-based heavy equipment for all projects involving dredging or construction activities. These actions could potentially result in short-term activities that, if not mitigated, could cause significant adverse effects to the environment. Such activities could include construction activities for treatment works, BMPs, and use of land or vessel-

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

based heavy equipment. Remedial actions that physically disturb the sediment, including dredging and capping, have the potential to adversely affect biological resources through: short-term habitat destruction and displacement of sensitive species, possibly during critical periods such as nesting, or disturbance of sensitive spawning and migrating fish species; unintentional “take” of endangered species; loss or burial of benthic communities; and degradation of water quality from increased turbidity and remobilization of contaminants into the water column and noise. Many of these effects can be mitigated by proper planning such as avoiding activities during critical windows associated with migration, nesting and spawning seasons. Displaced habitats should be replaced nearby with equal or greater area and density, and restoration of nearby areas. Remedial actions that bury or remove benthic communities by capping or dredging would be expected to improve habitat conditions by the removal of toxic pollutants in sediments. Over-dredging can be performed to ensure that appropriate cleanup levels are achieved to improve benthic habitat. All actions that could potentially disturb state or federally listed species or negatively impact waterbodies identified as essential fish habitat must consult with the appropriate trustee agencies identified in Section 6.7.3. Pre-project and post-project biological surveys can be used to apply adequate mitigation measures. Through permitting under CWA Section 401 or issuance of WDRs, ESA consultations, compliance with local, state and federal resource and land use laws, and appropriate mitigations measures, potentially significant impacts to biological resources can be reduced to less than significant with mitigation. Turbidity and water quality impacts are discussed in Section 6.9.9. Noise is discussed in Section 6.9.12. Potentially significant impacts to biological resources will be considered in each project related CEQA review.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Staff is not aware of any cultural resources present beneath subtidal sediments in bays and estuaries that could potentially be impacted through the adoption of the proposed amendments. However, our lack of awareness does not preclude the possibility of previously

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

unmapped cultural resources in near-shore subtidal locations that could be impacted by activities in response to exceedance of the narrative SQOs. As a result, any future actions that could impact cultural resources would be subject to CEQA on an individual case-by-case basis, and evaluated at that time.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Significant impacts to geology and soils would occur if a project exposed people or structures to potential, substantial adverse effects related to rupture of a known earthquake fault, other seismic events, or landslides. Significant impacts would also occur if a project

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>caused substantial erosion or was located in areas with unsuitable soils or landslide-prone conditions. Adoption of the proposed amendments would not increase risks associated with surface rupture or ground shaking or ground failure resulting from seismic motion. Reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance could include the need for construction or excavation activities on land or water. Dredging activities have the potential to destabilize channel slopes and undermine pilings. Excavation and grading on land can create slope instability and affect foundations. Standard engineering practices that account the geologic conditions and properties of soil and sediment onsite, and practices such as installation of sheet pile walls at the toe of the shore slope would reduce or avoid this impact. Following standard engineering practices and by complying with local state and federal laws and appropriate mitigations measures, potentially significant impacts from slope instability or landslides can be reduced to less than significant with mitigation. Mitigation measures will depend upon the geologic features, physical properties of the earth materials and the types of buildings or infrastructure in the immediate vicinity of the site. These factors and appropriate mitigation would be determined for each individual action during the project CEQA review.</p>				

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

a) Generate Greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of the proposed sediment quality objectives will not directly contribute to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, however reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance could include implementation of additional treatment works, clean-up, and remediation equipment that could generate emissions potentially contributing to GHG levels. Emissions from such operations are unknown but are unlikely to be significant when considered in the context of the state emissions inventory. In any event, due to the lack of data on potential emissions and their relative significance on global climate change, the potential cumulative impacts are far too speculative to analyze. At the programmatic level, it is not possible to estimate the number of monitoring and remediation efforts that could be initiated, the equipment or vehicles that might be required, or the locations throughout the state where such actions might be undertaken. Efforts to assess the level of benefits or adverse impacts of such projects would be speculative at this time. Individual projects will be subject to the appropriate level of environmental review at the time they are proposed, and mitigation would be identified as warranted prior to approval.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

This category refers to chemicals that have been discharged to the environment that may adversely impact the environment or human health and safety. Soil and groundwater impacted by such chemicals are also included. Significant impacts would occur if a project led to increased hazards to

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

the public or environment from transport, handling, or emissions of such materials. Also included are projects located near airports and listed hazardous materials sites.

Reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance could include construction activities for treatment works, BMPs, and/or removal actions using land or vessel-based heavy equipment. For these situations, potential impacts related to hazardous materials can be mitigated to less than significant levels with appropriate mitigation measures. In any action involving toxic pollutants, there is a potential for release of pollutants due to an accident or upset condition. The potential for such releases can be greatly reduced by proper planning. Measures to prevent releases of toxic pollutants include such things as pollution prevention technology (e.g., automatic sensors and shut-off valves, pressure and vacuum relief valves, secondary containment, air pollution control devices, double walled tanks and piping), access restrictions, fire controls, emergency power supplies, contingency planning for potential spills and releases, pollution prevention training and other types of mitigation appropriate to the cleanup plan. Trucking hazardous wastes through residential areas has the potential to result in the possibility of fire or explosion; exclusion of hazardous waste from certain neighborhoods; inability to get bridge-crossing permits in a timely manner may limit the feasibility of remedial measures. Identifying routes that avoid densely populated areas, selecting alternative means of transportation, developing traffic plans and notifying emergency services, can mitigate these hazards. Fuels, lubricating oils, and other petroleum products will be used during cleanup activity. Well-established techniques for controlling spills, leaks, and drips will be incorporated in the work plans to assure the control of petroleum products and any other chemicals used during the cleanup activity. Develop procedures and requirements for loading and unloading polluted sediments to eliminate potential for spillage. Project workers and supervisors are required to comply with applicable Occupational of Health and Safety Administration (OSHA) training requirements for site clean-up personnel. In addition, site-specific health and safety plans would be prepared in accordance with California Code of Regulations, tit. 8, § 5192 and 29 C.F.R. section 1910.120, which govern site clean-up. These potential impacts can be reduced to less than significant with mitigation measures. These measures would be identified on a case-by-case basis during the project specific CEQA review.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Significant impacts to hydrology and water quality would occur if a project substantially alters existing drainage patterns, alters the course of a river or stream, violates water quality standards, or creates or contributes to runoff that would exceed the capacity of local storm water drainage systems. Significant impacts would also occur if a project placed housing or other structures within the 100-year flood plain, or exposed people or structures to significant risks from flooding, seiches, or tsunamis. Reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance could include construction activities for treatment works, BMPs, and/or removal actions using land or vessel-based heavy equipment. For these situations, drainage patterns, increased runoff, or violations of water quality standards could occur. These potentially significant impacts can be reduced to less than significant through appropriate mitigation measures.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Runoff from construction of BMPs, treatment works, excavation activities, or disposal of dredged materials on land can be reduced by working during the dry season or by implementing BMPs to reduce erosion. In addition to the Water Boards' storm water permitting requirements, many local governments also have erosion control ordinances and grading ordinances. Storm water diversions intended to improve water and sediment quality are not expected to degrade receiving water quality; rather, these actions would improve water and sediment quality by means of additional treatment.

Dredging equipment can cause turbulence in the waterbody, and thus, the dredging process can cause short-term adverse impacts to water quality from turbidity or from stirring up pollutants in the sediment. These impacts can be regulated through WDRs and can be reduced by requiring use of dredging equipment or operations that minimize the discharge of chemical pollutants during dredging (e.g., use of clam shell dredger, etc.), use of settling tanks to reduce excessive turbidity in the discharge, use of silt curtains to reduce dispersal of the turbidity plume beyond the dredge site, coffer dams in small channels, and accurate positioning of disposal equipment during dredging. Changes in bottom contours brought by dredging or capping would probably have minimal effects on water circulation if properly managed. Relatively small areas are under consideration for modification at most of the sites. At larger sites, removal and placement will attempt to retain regional bottom depth and contour, except where bathymetry is planned for environmental improvement. Where site and exposure conditions are complex, hydrodynamic, fate, transport, and bioaccumulation models can be used to estimate potential short and long term impacts stemming from remedial actions such as removal, capping, and monitored natural attenuation under a variety of conditions. These tools could also assist in identifying appropriate mitigation measures. The Water Boards have extensive authority to reduce and control impacts associated with storm water runoff and impacts caused by dredging. Through permitting under CWA Section 401, WDRs, compliance with local, state and federal resource and land use laws and coupled with appropriate mitigation measures required by the Water Boards, potentially significant impacts to biological resources can be reduced to less than significant with mitigation. Potentially significant impacts to biological resources will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis in the project specific CEQA review and the appropriate site-specific mitigation measures identified at that time.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Significant impacts to land use and planning would occur if a project physically divided a community, conflicted with a land use plan, policy or regulation, or caused conflict with a habitat conservation plan. General plans and zoning delineate those areas that will be developed, and the type and density of development to be allowed. Adopting of the proposed amendments is not expected to result in conflict with any applicable and use plan policy or regulation.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Significant impacts to mineral resources would occur if a project resulted in the loss of a mineral resource of value locally, regionally, or statewide. There is no evidence that the adoption of the proposed amendments would result in the loss of a known mineral resource or availability of the mineral resources. Our lack of awareness, however, does not preclude the possibility of mineral resources that could be impacted by construction activities in response to these proposed amendments. Any such construction would be subject to CEQA on an individual case-by-case basis, and potential impacts to mineral resources would be evaluated at that time.

XII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
noise levels?				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Significant impacts from noise would occur if a project exposed people to noise or groundborne vibration in excess of established standards in a local general plan or noise ordinance or resulted in a substantial permanent increase to ambient noise levels. Significant impacts can also occur if a project causes substantial temporary or periodic increases in noise or if a project is located in the vicinity of an airport and would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance could include construction activities for treatment works, BMPs, and/or removal actions using land or vessel-based heavy equipment that could potentially result in short-term noise pollution related to construction activities and use of land or vessel-based heavy equipment for all projects involving dredging or construction activities. Mitigation would consist of compliance with local noise ordinances (typical standards include blackouts prohibiting use of heavy equipment on Sundays, early morning hours and evenings all week, and on holidays), use of noise dampening material or barriers around equipment, locating equipment as far as practical from noise-sensitive areas including sensitive habitats and residences and selecting haul routes that avoids sensitive habitats and minimizes impacts within residential areas. Compliance with local noise ordinances and mitigation measures would reduce potential significant effects associated with these reasonable methods of compliance to less than significant with mitigation. Appropriate mitigation measures would be identified on a case-by-case basis during the project specific CEQA review.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Significant impacts to population and housing would occur if a project substantially encouraged population growth, displacing substantial numbers of people from existing housing and thereby necessitating construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Adoption of the proposed amendments is not expected to result in the need for more housing or displace residents in existing communities.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
vi) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Implementation of the proposed amendments is not expected to directly impact public services. This does not, however, preclude the possibility that public services could be

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
impacted by construction activities in response to these proposed amendments. Any such construction activity would be subject to CEQA on an individual case-by-case basis, and potential impacts to public services would be evaluated at that time.				

XV. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Adoption of the proposed amendments is not expected to directly impact recreational uses. This does not, however, preclude the possibility of recreational uses that could be impacted by construction activities or remedial actions in response to the proposed amendments. Any such impacts would be short term and subject to CEQA on an individual case-by-case basis, and potential impacts to recreational resources would be evaluated at that time.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
change in location that result in substantial safety risks?				
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Significant impacts to transportation and traffic would occur if a project caused a substantial increase in traffic in relation to existing traffic load/capacity of the existing street system, exceeded established level of service standards, resulted in change in air traffic patterns, lead to increases in road-related hazards, resulted in inadequate emergency access or parking. Reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance could include construction activities for treatment works, BMPs, and/or removal actions using land or vessel-based heavy equipment that could potentially result in short-term increase in traffic from construction activities and use of land or vessel-based heavy equipment for all projects involving dredging or haul trucks. Preparation of traffic control plan that identifies routes that avoid schools and residential areas. Ensure that traffic controls are maintained through out the project. Avoid loading and handling materials in densely populated areas, cover all loads and ensure that trucks comply local state and federal requirements and weight limits over bridges. Vessels and barges that could disrupt boat and shipping traffic would require approval from port authorities, Harbor Master and U.S. Coast Guard in addition to Coast Guard certifications for pilots and commercial vessels. However these impacts would be mitigated under CEQA specifically for each project. Implementation of the proposed amendments is not expected to directly impact transportation uses or circulation patterns. This does not, however, preclude the possibility of transportation uses or circulation patterns being impacted by construction activities in response to the proposed amendments. Any such construction would be subject to CEQA on an individual case-by-case basis, and potential impacts to transportation/circulation would be evaluated at that time.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Significant impacts to utilities and service systems would occur if a project exceeded wastewater treatment standards, required construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or new or expanded storm water drainage facilities, or a project’s water needs exceeded existing resources or entitlements. Significant impacts would also occur if a project was not served by a landfill with sufficient capacity or the project failed to comply with federal, state, or local regulations for solid waste. Failure to meet the proposed objective could potentially result in the need for additional controls and treatment to reduce the discharge of pollutants into waterbodies. As stated previously, it is unlikely that treatment plants that comply with the CWA, the Water Code, the toxic pollutant criteria in the NTR and CTR, the implementation provisions in the SIP, and Basin Plans will cause exceedances of the proposed SQO. Discharge reductions can be accomplished through (1) treatment process optimization (measures facilities can implement to modify or adjust the operating efficiency of the existing wastewater treatment process – such measures usually involve engineering analysis of the existing treatment process to identify adjustments to enhance pollutant removal or reduce chemical additional); (2) waste minimization/pollution prevention costs (conducting a facility waste minimization or pollution prevention study); (3) pretreatment (conducting study of sources and reducing inflow from indirect discharges); or (4) new or additional treatment systems. For storm water, implementation of BMPs can also be applied to reduce pollutants, rather than treatment of storm water to remove pollutants. Because of the nature of storm water discharges, the Water Boards have not typically established numeric

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

effluent limitations for toxic pollutants in storm water permits. The limitations contained in storm water permits are typically narrative and include the requirement to implement the appropriate control practices and/or BMPs. BMPs can range from good housekeeping to structural controls.

In some cases, the cleanup of sites may generate significant amounts of waste materials that could be disposed in an appropriately designated solid waste disposal site. This could create increased demand for landfill capacity. In order to assess the potential effect to landfills, the areal extent and volume of sediment should be characterized. Once this is done, project impact to landfill capacity can be evaluated. If estimates exceed capacities, plans for alternative sites or other alternative means of disposal to remove impact (e.g., land based confined disposal facilities, capping confined aquatic disposal, wetland restoration, levee reuse). These potentially significant environmental effects can be reduced to less than significant with mitigation measures. These measures would be identified during the project specific CEQA review.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PRELIMINARY STAFF DETERMINATION

- 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.