
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) REQUIREMENTS

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region (Los Angeles Waterboard) 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 incorporate a site-specific objective for Reach 6 of the Los Angeles River.

The Secretary of Resources has certified the State Water Resources Control Board and Los Angeles Water Board's 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 Los Angeles Water 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 Los Angeles Water Board to complete an environmental checklist as part of its substitute environmental documents.

The Los Angeles Water Board 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,

(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 Los Angeles Water 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 to Incorporate a Site-Specific Chloride Objective for Reach 6 of the Los Angeles River”, with the responses to comments, and the resolution approving the amendment fulfill the requirements of California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 3777, subdivision (a), and the Los Angeles Water Board substantive CEQA obligations. In preparing these CEQA substitute documents, the Los Angeles Water 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 Los Angeles Water Board is amending the Water Quality Control Plan (known as the Basin Plan) to establish a site-specific chloride objective in the Los Angeles River upstream of the Sepulveda Flood Control Basin (Reach 6). This amendment will revise the chloride objective from 150 mg/L to 190 mg/L. In 1997, the Los Angeles Water Board adopted Resolution 97-002, revising the chloride water quality objectives in the Basin Plan for other reaches of the Los Angeles River in which Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) were discharging, to reflect the increase in chloride in imported water

supplies. Reach 6 was not included in the 1997 revision as there were no POTW discharges in the reach at that time.

This revised chloride objective for Reach 6 is the same water quality objective that applies in further downstream reaches of the Los Angeles River. The proposed chloride objective is fully protective of beneficial uses in this waterbody.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND BASELINE CONDITIONS

The Los Angeles River Watershed covers an area of approximately 834 square miles. The Los Angeles River begins at the confluence of Arroyo Calabasas and Bell Creek in Canoga Park and flows 51 miles from the western end of the San Fernando Valley to the Pacific Ocean in Long Beach. Reach 6 is a segment of the Los Angeles River that begins at the head of the Los Angeles River and ends above the Sepulveda Flood Control Basin at Balboa Boulevard. Reach 6 also includes the following major tributaries: Caballero Creek, Aliso Canyon Wash, Browns Canyon Wash, Arroyo Calabasas, and Bell Creek. Reach 6 lies above the San Fernando Valley Groundwater Basin. Encompassing an area of approximately 152 square miles, the land use in the Reach 6 subwatershed is primarily single family residential followed by open space and vacant land.

The Los Angeles Water Board considered potential environmental impacts arising from the revised chloride objective in downstream reaches when originally adopting Resolution 97-002. Updated and new data were utilized to consider the potential impacts arising from the new revision to the chloride water quality objective for Reach 6 of the Los Angeles River.

The detailed environmental setting and basis for the proposed amendment to revise the chloride water quality objectives are set forth in the technical staff report. The report, "Proposed Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan to Incorporate a Site-Specific Chloride Objective for Reach 6 of the Los Angeles River".

The baseline condition, that is, the pre-project conditions, will not change when the proposed Basin Plan amendment is adopted and there will be no increment between the pre-project and likely post-project environmental conditions.

III. CHECKLIST

1. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	No Impact
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	No Impact

Question	CEQA Determination
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	No Impact
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	No Impact

2. 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 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 the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
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?	No Impact
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	No Impact
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))?	No Impact
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No Impact
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?	No Impact

3. AIR QUALITY

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

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	No Impact
b) 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?	No Impact
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	No Impact
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	No Impact

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
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 Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or NOAA Fisheries?	No Impact
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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	No Impact
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	No Impact
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?	No Impact
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	No Impact
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?	No Impact

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to in §15064.5?	No Impact
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	No Impact
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	No Impact

6. ENERGY

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	No Impact
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	No Impact

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? iv) Landslides? 	No Impact
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	No Impact
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?	No Impact
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	No Impact
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?	No Impact
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	No Impact

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	No Impact
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	No Impact

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	No Impact
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?	No Impact
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	No Impact
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?	No Impact
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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	No Impact
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	No Impact
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	No Impact

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	No Impact
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	No Impact
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	No Impact
(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	No Impact
(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	No Impact
(iii) 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; or	No Impact
(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	No Impact
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	No Impact
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	No Impact

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Physically divide an established community?	No Impact
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	No Impact

12. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
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?	No Impact
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?	No Impact

13. NOISE

Would the project result in:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	No Impact
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	No Impact
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?	No Impact

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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)?	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

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 following public services:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Fire protection?	No Impact
b) Police protection?	No Impact
c) Schools?	No Impact
d) Parks?	No Impact
e) Other public facilities?	No Impact

16. RECREATION

Question	CEQA Determination
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?	No Impact
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?	No Impact

17. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	No Impact
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	No Impact
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	No Impact
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	No Impact

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	No Impact
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	No Impact

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	No Impact
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	No Impact
c) 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?	No Impact
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	No Impact

Question	CEQA Determination
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	No Impact

20. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	No Impact
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	No Impact
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	No Impact
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	No Impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Question	CEQA Determination
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?	No
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)	No

Question	CEQA Determination
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	No

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 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.

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.

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

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would result in any new discharge to surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality. The proposed amendment will not require that water entering the system be treated differently than it has prior to this amendment (e.g., through additional treatment, diversion, etc.).

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

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.

Tapia WRF was permitted to discharge at 190 mg/l of chloride from 1999-2017. No impacts to animal life were observed and therefore no potential impacts to plant life are expected due to the amendment.

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.

Tapia WRF was permitted to discharge at 190 mg/l of chloride from 1999-2017. No impacts to animal life were observed and therefore no potential impacts to animal life are expected due to the amendment.

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?

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

Tapia WRF was permitted to discharge at 190 mg/l of chloride from 1999-2017. No impacts to animal life were observed and therefore no potential impacts to existing fish or wildlife are expected due to the amendment.

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 noise, neither natural nor 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 increase noise, neither natural nor 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 increase light, neither natural nor 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 landuse patterns. The amendment continues to support the same designated beneficial uses.

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.

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 landuse 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 landuse 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.

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.

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, 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 of 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 of energy consumption or that would require 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.

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 sewers or septic tanks or that would lead to a change in landuse 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 storm water drainage systems or that would lead to a change in landuse patterns that would lead to a change in demand for 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 solid waste disposal or that would lead to a change in landuse 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.

The proposed amendment will not require any actions that would create any health hazard or potential health hazard. The proposed basin plan amendment requires criteria according to the California Toxics Rule that protect human health.

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.

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. The proposal will have a beneficial impact by protecting aquatic life-related beneficial uses.

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.

The goal of this amendment is to align the chloride water quality objective in Reach 6 of the Los Angeles River with the objectives set for the other reaches that also contain POTW discharges. The discharges from Tapia WRF to Reach 6 are infrequent and relatively small compared to downstream POTW discharges.

Therefore, there will be no potential to 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.

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.

The project will not achieve short-term goals, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals because the project will not change water quality or other environmental conditions in the Los Angeles River Reach 6.

Cumulative: Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?

Answer: No.

The amendment revises the water quality objective for chloride to 190 mg/L in Reach 6 of the Los Angeles River. The chloride water quality objectives in other downstream reaches of the river were previously revised to 190 mg/L which was determined to be fully protective of beneficial uses. Reach 6 does not have any additional beneficial uses compared to the downstream reaches so the amendment should have no cumulative impacts. Additionally, water quality data from Reach 6 (without discharges from Tapia WRF) shows chloride concentrations similar to that in the effluent, further supporting the conclusion that the revision of the water quality objectives will not result in environmental impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

In addition, because there are no other Basin Plan amendments contemplated for the Los Angeles River Reach 6 at this time, there are no circumstances that can reasonably be forecasted which would collectively cause a significant adverse cumulative impact to aquatic life or any other environmental resources in the reach.

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

Answer: No.

This amendment will ensure the protection of water quality in the Los Angeles River and does not require any actions that would result in adverse effects on human beings.

V. PRELIMINARY STAFF DETERMINATION

The revision of the Basin Plan to incorporate a site-specific Chloride objective for Reach 6 of the Los Angeles River will align the chloride water quality objective for all reaches of the Los Angeles River to which POTWs discharge, while being fully protective of beneficial uses.

On the basis of the substitute environmental documents for the TMDL implementation plan revision, 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