



California Regional Water Quality Control Board

Los Angeles Region



Winston H. Hickox
Secretary for
Environmental
Protection

320 W. 4th Street, Suite 200, Los Angeles, California 90013
Phone (213) 576-6600 FAX (213) 576-6640
Internet Address: <http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb4>

Gray Davis
Governor

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT REQUIREMENTS

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region (hereinafter referred to as the Regional Board) is the Lead Agency for evaluating the environmental impacts of the proposed amendment to the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region (Basin Plan)*. The proposed amendment incorporates a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for chloride in the Upper Santa Clara River. The Secretary of Resources has certified the basin planning process as exempt from certain requirements under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including preparation of an initial study, a negative declaration and environmental impact report (California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 15251). 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 functionally equivalent to an initial study, negative declaration, and/or environmental impact report.

Any regulatory program of the Regional Board certified as functionally equivalent, however, must satisfy the documentation requirements of California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 3777(a) which requires the following:

- A written report providing:
 - a description of the proposed activity;
 - reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity; and
 - mitigation measures to minimize any significant adverse impacts.
- A completed environmental checklist that includes:
 - a checklist of environmental impacts;
 - a discussion of the environmental evaluation; and
 - a determination with respect to significant environmental impacts.

The attached checklist and the TMDL for chloride in the Upper Santa Clara River fulfill the requirements specified under section 3777, subdivision (a).

I. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTIVITY

The Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region (also known as a Basin Plan) designates beneficial uses of waterbodies, establishes water quality objectives for the protection of these beneficial uses, and outlines a plan of implementation for maintaining and enhancing water quality. Chloride loading to the Upper Santa Clara River exceeds water quality standards associated with agricultural supply and groundwater recharge. Chloride concentration above 100-

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.

120 mg/L might cause leaf-tip burn in avocado and reduce crop yield. The proposed amendment would incorporate into the Basin Plan a TMDL to reduce chloride load to the Santa Clara River.

The Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for Santa Clara River will require wastewater treatment plants and others to reduce the amount of chloride discharged to the Santa Clara River. This may require dischargers to improve their systems.



II ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Environmental Impacts
YES MAYBE NO

<p>1.</p>	<p>Earth. Will the proposal result in:</p> <p>a. Unstable earth conditions or in changes in geologic substructures?</p> <p>b. Disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcoming of the soil?</p> <p>c. Change in topography or ground surface relief features?</p> <p>d. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?</p> <p>e. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?</p> <p>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?</p> <p>g. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards, such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>NO</p> <p>NO</p> <p>NO</p> <p>NO</p> <p>MAYBE</p> <p>NO</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Air. Will the proposal result in:</p> <p>a. Substantial air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality?</p> <p>b. The creation of objectionable odors?</p> <p>c. Alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>NO</p> <p>NO</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Water. Will the proposal result in:</p> <p>a. Changes in currents, or the course of direction or water movements, in either marine or fresh waters?</p> <p>b. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface water runoff?</p> <p>c. Alterations to the course of flow of flood waters?</p>	<p>MAYBE</p> <p>MAYBE</p> <p>NO</p>

II ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Environmental Impacts
YES MAYBE NO

	d. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?	MAYBE
	e. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity?	YES
	f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground waters?	MAYBE
	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?	YES
	h. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?	NO
	i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding or tidal waves?	NO
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)?	NO
	b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?	NO
	c. Introduction of new species of plants into an area, or in a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?	NO
	d. Reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop?	NO
5.	Animal Life. Will the proposal result in:	
	a. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?	NO
	b. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?	NO

II ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

		Environmental Impacts YES MAYBE NO
	c. Deterioration to existing fish or wildlife habitat?	NO
6.	Noise. Will the proposal result in:	
	a. Increases in existing noise levels?	MAYBE
	b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	NO
7.	Light and Glare. Will the proposal:	
	Produce new light or glare?	NO
8.	Land Use. Will the proposal result in:	
	Substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?	NO
9.	Natural Resources. Will the proposal result in:	
	a. Increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?	NO
	b. Substantial depletion of any nonrenewable natural resource?	NO
10.	Risk of Upset. 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?	NO
11.	Population. Will the proposal:	
	Alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area?	NO
12.	Housing. Will the proposal:	
	Affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?	NO
13.	Transportation/Circulation. Will the proposal result in:	

II ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

		Environmental Impacts YES MAYBE NO
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement? b. Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking? c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems? d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods? e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic? f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians? 	<p>MAYBE</p> <p>NO</p> <p>NO</p> <p>NO</p> <p>NO</p> <p>NO</p>
14.	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Fire protection? b. Police protection? c. Schools? d. Parks or other recreational facilities? e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? f. Other governmental services? 	<p>NO</p> <p>NO</p> <p>NO</p> <p>NO</p> <p>NO</p> <p>YES</p>
15.	<p>Energy. Will the proposal result in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy? b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy? 	<p>MAYBE</p> <p>NO</p>
16.	<p>Utilities and Service Systems. Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:</p>	

II ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

		Environmental Impacts YES MAYBE NO
	a. Power or natural gas?	NO
	b. Communications systems?	NO
	c. Water?	MAYBE
	d. Sewer or septic tanks?	NO
	e. Storm water drainage?	NO
	f. Solid waste and disposal?	NO
17.	Human Health. Will the proposal result in:	
	a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?	NO
	b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?	NO
18.	Aesthetics. Will the proposal result in:	
	a. The obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public?	NO
	b. The creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?	NO
19.	Recreation. Will the proposal result in:	
	a. Impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?	NO
20.	Archeological/Historical. Will the proposal: Result in the alteration of a significant archeological or historical site structure, object or building?	NO
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	NO

II ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

		Environmental Impacts YES MAYBE NO
	endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	
	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.)	NO
	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.)	NO
	Substantial adverse: Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	NO

III. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

Expand on all “YES” and “MAYBE” answers given to the preceding questions in regard to environmental impacts. The evaluation shall consider whether the environmental impact indicated will have a substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the activity. In addition, the evaluation should discuss environmental effects in proportion to their severity and probability of occurrence. (Use additional pages if necessary.)

Section II. Number 1, part f, answered MAYBE.

A slight change in the amount of surface water may occur if existing wastewaters discharged through NPDES permits are adjusted to meet the TMDL requirements. A change in the surface flow volume may result in a change of the stream morphology. Such discharges would be regulated by the Regional Board under NPDES permits and are not expected to adversely impact beneficial uses of surface waters.

Section II. Number 3, part a,b,d and f, answered MAYBE.

A slight change in the amount of surface and groundwater may occur if existing wastewaters discharged through NPDES permits are adjusted to meet the TMDL requirements. A change in the surface flow and groundwater volume may result in a change of the stream morphology, disposition of surface runoff and groundwater discharge and the direction of flow. Such discharges would be regulated by the Regional Board under NPDES permits, and are not expected to adversely impact beneficial uses of surface waters. It is not expected to adversely impact beneficial uses of groundwater because the volume of water affected is small relative to the volume of the groundwater basin.

Section II. Number 3, part e, answered YES.

A change in the quality of surface water may occur if existing wastewaters discharged through NPDES permits are adjusted to meet the TMDL requirements and are not expected to adversely impact beneficial uses of surface waters

Section II. Number 3, part g, answered YES.

A change in the quality of surface water and the groundwater it recharges may occur if existing wastewater discharged through NPDES permits are adjusted to meet the TMDL requirements. This may result in a change in quantity or quality of flow of groundwater. It is not expected to adversely impact beneficial uses of groundwater because the volume of water affected is small relative to the volume of the groundwater basin.

Section II, Number 6, part a, answered MAYBE.

Depending on the implementation strategy chosen, the proposal may result in temporary increases in existing noise levels.

Section II, Number 13, part a, answered MAYBE.

Increased use of cannister-type water softeners may require a slight increase in truck traffic to remove spent and provide regenerated cannisters.

III. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

Section II, Number 14, part f, answered YES.

The TMDL requirements may necessitate action on the part of local public agencies to adjust their effluent concentrations. Such changes would be reported to the Regional Board under NPDES permits and are not expected to adversely impact beneficial uses of surface waters and is expected to be environmentally beneficial.

Section II, Number 15, part a, answered MAYBE.

Dischargers may choose to meet the TMDL requirements using treatment technology which will require greater energy expenditures.

Section II, Number 16, part c, answered MAYBE.

The TMDL requirements may necessitate changes in the operations of waste dischargers. Such changes would be reported to the Regional Board under NPDES permits, and are not expected to adversely impact beneficial uses of surface waters.

Many of the environmental impacts listed above are “positive” impacts, while the majority of adverse impacts are limited, short-term impacts, which may be necessary to achieve the long-term environmental benefits of the TMDL. Appropriate mitigation measures can be deployed to address the short-term impacts. The implementation of this TMDL will result in better water quality and protect the existing agriculture supply and ground water recharge beneficial uses.



IV. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

X I find the proposed Basin Plan amendment could not have a significant effect on the environment.

 I find that the proposed Basin Plan amendment could have a significant adverse effect on the environment. However, there are feasible alternatives and/or feasible mitigation measures that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impact. These alternatives are discussed in the attached written report.

 I find the proposed Basin Plan amendment may have a significant effect on the environment. There are no feasible alternatives and/or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts. See the attached written report for a discussion of this determination.

DATE:

Dennis A. Dickerson
Executive Officer