

## APPENDIX D – ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

### *California Environmental Quality Act Requirements*

The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board or Board), as a Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), is responsible for evaluating all the potential environmental impacts that may occur due to changes made to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins (Basin Plan). (Pub. Resources Code, §21000 et seq.) The Secretary of Resources has determined that the Central Valley Water Board's Basin Planning Process qualifies as a certified regulatory program pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.5 and California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 15251(g). This determination means that the Central Valley Water Board's Basin Planning process needs only to comply with abbreviated CEQA requirements. The Staff Report and this Checklist satisfy the requirements of State Water Board's Regulations for Implementation of CEQA, Exempt Regulatory Programs, which are found at California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 3775 et seq.

#### 1. Project title:

Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins to dedesignate the MUN beneficial use from specific agricultural dominated surface water bodies in the Sacramento River Basin

#### 2. Lead agency name and address:

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region  
11020 Sun Center Drive, #200, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

#### 3. Contact person and phone number:

Anne Littlejohn, Environmental Scientist, (916) 464-4840  
Jeanne Chilcott, Environmental Program Manager, (916) 464-4788

#### 4. Project location:

The project is located within the Sacramento River Basin, in the Central Valley. The project is in Butte, Colusa, Sutter and Glenn counties in the vicinity of the cities of Biggs, Colusa, Live Oak and Willows.

5. Description of project: The Central Valley Water Board is proposing amendments to the Basin Plan to dedesignate the MUN beneficial use from twelve water bodies in the Sacramento River Basin. The affected water bodies are in four subareas: Willows, Colusa, Biggs, and Live Oak. The specific water bodies to have the MUN use dedesignated are:

- Biggs subarea: Lateral K, Main Drainage Canal (C Main Drain), and Cherokee Canal
- Colusa subarea: Unnamed Tributary to Powell Slough, New Ditch (2011; tributary to Unnamed Tributary), and Powell Slough

- Live Oak subarea: Lateral 2, Lateral 1, Western Intercepting Canal, East Interceptor Canal, and Wadsworth Canal.
- Willows subarea: Ag Drain C (Logan Creek)

## EVALUATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS IN THE CHECKLIST

1. The board must complete an environmental checklist prior to the adoption of plans or policies for the Basin/208 Planning program as certified by the Secretary for Natural Resources. The checklist becomes a part of the Substitute Environmental Documentation (SED).

2. For each environmental category in the checklist, the board must determine whether the project will cause any adverse impact. If there are potential impacts that are not included in the sample checklist, those impacts should be added to the checklist.

3. If the board determines that a particular adverse impact may occur as a result of the project, then the checklist boxes must indicate whether the impact is “Potentially Significant,” “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated,” or “Less than Significant.”

a. “Potentially Significant Impact” applies if there is substantial evidence that an impact may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries on the checklist, the SED must include an examination of feasible alternatives and mitigation measures for each such impact, similar to the requirements for preparing an environmental impact report.

b. “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies if the board or another agency incorporates mitigation measures into the SED that will reduce an impact that is “Potentially Significant” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” If the board does not require the specific mitigation measures itself, then the board must be certain that the other agency will in fact incorporate those measures.

c. “Less than Significant” applies if the impact will not be significant, and mitigation is therefore not required.

d. If there will be no impact, check the box under “No Impact.”

4. The board must provide a brief explanation for each “Potentially Significant,” “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated,” “Less than Significant,” or “No Impact” determination in the checklist. The explanation may be included in the written report described in section 3777(a)(1) or in the checklist itself. The explanation of each issue should identify: (a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and (b) the specific mitigation measure(s) identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant. The board may determine the significance of the impact by considering factual evidence, agency standards, or thresholds. If the “No Impact” box is checked, the board should briefly provide the basis for that answer. If there are types of impacts that are not listed in the checklist, those impacts should be added to the checklist.

5. The board must include mandatory findings of significance if required by CEQA Guidelines section 15065.

6. The board should provide references used to identify potential impacts, including a list of information sources and individuals contacted.

ISSUES	<i>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>NO IMPACT</i>
<b>I. AESTHETICS. Would the Project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Discussion:</u> The removal of MUN as a designated beneficial use of specific water bodies in the Willows, Colusa, Biggs, and Live Oak subareas of the Sacramento River Basin would mean that State water quality objectives for protection of drinking water and federal water quality criteria (defined in the California Toxics Rule (CTR)) for the protection of human health from the consumption of water and organisms would no longer apply to these water bodies. Thus, waste dischargers to these water bodies would not be required to reduce concentrations of constituents exceeding objectives and criteria for protection of MUN in these water bodies. Waste discharges to the water bodies would continue to be regulated to achieve water quality objectives/criteria for the remaining designated beneficial uses of the water bodies, and to not cause exceedance of applicable objectives/criteria in downstream waters, including criteria/objectives for protection of MUN where that use remains a designated use. Approval of the proposed change to the Basin Plan would not change flows, surface water elevations, or water quality in these water bodies relative to existing conditions, because POTW and agricultural discharge quantity and quality would remain similar to existing conditions following adoption of the proposed Basin Plan amendment. The proposed Basin Plan amendment would have <b>no impact</b> on receiving water aesthetics, because the proposed amendment would result in no change to the current conditions in the affected water bodies.</p>				

ISSUES	<i>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>NO IMPACT</i>
<p><b>II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental impacts, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forestry 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 forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.</p> <p><b>Would the project:</b></p>				
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"/>
<p><u>Discussion:</u> The water bodies affected by the proposed Basin Plan amendment are surrounded by agricultural lands, not forestland. With the proposed Basin Plan amendment, there would be no change to the relevant agricultural beneficial use (AGR) designation of the affected water bodies, and water quality objectives for protection of the AGR use would continue to apply. The proposed Basin Plan amendment will remove the MUN water quality objectives and thus reduce the restrictions that complying with these objectives might have on agricultural activities. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan amendment would</p>				

ISSUES	<i>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>NO IMPACT</i>
have <b>no impact</b> on agriculture and forestry resources.				
<b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b> 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. <b>Would the Project:</b>				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES	<i>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>NO IMPACT</i>
--------	---	---	---	----------------------

Discussion: The removal of MUN as a designated beneficial use of specific water bodies in the Willows, Colusa, Biggs, and Live Oak subareas of the Sacramento River Basin would mean that State water quality objectives for protection of drinking water and federal water quality criteria (defined in the CTR) for the protection of human health from the consumption of water and organisms would no longer apply to these water bodies. Thus, waste dischargers to these water bodies would not be required to reduce concentrations of constituents exceeding objectives and criteria for protection of MUN in these water bodies. Waste discharges to the water bodies would continue to be regulated to achieve water quality objectives/criteria for the remaining designated beneficial uses of the water bodies, and to not cause exceedance of applicable objectives/criteria in downstream waters, including objectives/criteria for protection of MUN where that use remains a designated use. Of relevance to air quality resources, the Willows POTW would not be required to convert from chlorine disinfection to ultraviolet light (UV) disinfection to reduce concentrations of the volatile trihalomethane (THM) compounds chloroform, bromodichloromethane, and dibromochloromethane in the effluent discharge. However, receiving water concentrations of these THM compounds would continue to be regulated by federal CTR criteria for protection from the consumption of organisms only. THMs are volatile compounds, thus as these compounds are transported in the receiving waters, concentrations decrease as these compounds are lost to the atmosphere. Air quality management in the Willows, Colusa, Biggs, and Live Oak subareas is focused on particulates and greenhouse gas-related pollutants. THMs are not an air quality concern at the low concentrations that would occur in the POTW effluent. Because POTW effluent quality would be unchanged relative to existing conditions with the proposed change to the Basin Plan, there would be no change in the associated air quality relative to existing conditions following adoption of the proposed Basin Plan amendment. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan amendment would have **no impact** on air quality.

**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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>ISSUES</b>	<i>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>NO IMPACT</i>
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?				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

Discussion: With the proposed Basin Plan amendment, there would be no change to relevant biological resources-related beneficial use designations (e.g., WARM, COLD, WILD, BIOL, RARE, MIGR, SPWN) of the affected water bodies and water quality objectives for protection of these uses would continue to apply. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan amendment would have **no impact** on biological resources.

**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 geological 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"/>

ISSUES	<i>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>NO IMPACT</i>
--------	---	---	---	----------------------

Discussion: The removal of MUN as a designated beneficial use of specific water bodies in the Willows, Colusa, Biggs, and Live Oak subareas of the Sacramento River Basin would mean that State water quality objectives for protection of drinking water and federal water quality criteria (defined in the CTR) for the protection of human health from the consumption of water and organisms would no longer apply to these water bodies. Thus, waste dischargers to these water bodies would not be required to reduce concentrations of constituents exceeding objectives and criteria for protection of MUN in these water bodies. Waste discharges to the water bodies would continue to be regulated to achieve water quality objectives/criteria for the remaining designated beneficial uses of the water bodies, and to not cause exceedance of applicable objectives/criteria in downstream waters, including criteria/objectives for protection of MUN where that use remains a designated use. Approval of the proposed change to the Basin Plan would not change flows, surface water elevations, or water quality in these water bodies relative to existing conditions, because POTW and agricultural discharge quantity and quality would remain similar to existing conditions following adoption of the proposed Basin Plan amendment. There would be no ground disturbance that would occur. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan amendment would have **no impact** on cultural resources.

**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:				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>ISSUES</b>	<i>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>NO IMPACT</i>
subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				
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"/>

Discussion: The removal of MUN as a designated beneficial use of specific water bodies in the Willows, Colusa, Biggs, and Live Oak subareas of the Sacramento River Basin would mean that State water quality objectives for protection of drinking water and federal water quality criteria (defined in the CTR) for the protection of human health from the consumption of water and organisms would no longer apply to these water bodies. Thus, waste dischargers to these water bodies would not be required to reduce concentrations of constituents exceeding objectives and criteria for protection of MUN in these water bodies. Waste discharges to the water bodies would continue to be regulated to achieve water quality objectives/criteria for the remaining designated beneficial uses of the water bodies, and to not cause exceedance of applicable objectives/criteria in downstream waters, including criteria/objectives for protection of MUN where that use remains a designated use. Approval of the proposed change to the Basin Plan would not change flows, water surface elevations, or water quality in these water bodies relative to existing conditions, because POTW and agricultural discharge quantity and quality would remain similar to existing conditions following adoption of the proposed Basin Plan amendment. There would be no ground disturbance that would occur. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan amendment would have **no impact** on geology and soils.

**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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The removal of MUN as a designated beneficial use of specific water bodies in the Willows, Colusa, Biggs, and Live Oak subareas of the Sacramento River Basin would mean that State water quality objectives for protection of drinking water and federal water quality criteria (defined in the CTR) for the protection of human health from the consumption of water and organisms would no longer apply to these

ISSUES	<i>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>NO IMPACT</i>
<p>water bodies. Thus, waste dischargers to these water bodies would not be required to reduce concentrations of constituents exceeding objectives and criteria for protection of MUN in these water bodies. Waste discharges to the water bodies would continue to be regulated to achieve water quality objectives/criteria for the remaining designated beneficial uses of the water bodies, and to not cause exceedance of applicable objectives/criteria in downstream waters, including criteria/objectives for protection of MUN where that use remains a designated use. Approval of the proposed change to the Basin Plan would not change flows, water surface elevations, or water quality in these water bodies relative to existing conditions, because POTW and agricultural discharge quantity and quality would remain similar to existing conditions following adoption of the proposed Basin Plan amendment. There would be no release of greenhouse gas-related pollutants as a result of the project that would occur. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan amendment would have <b>no impact</b> on greenhouse gas emissions.</p>				
<b>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the Project:</b>				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES	<i>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>NO IMPACT</i>
airstrip, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?				
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"/>
<p><u>Discussion:</u> The removal of MUN as a designated beneficial use of specific water bodies in the Willows, Colusa, Biggs, and Live Oak subareas of the Sacramento River Basin would mean that State water quality objectives for protection of drinking water and federal water quality criteria (defined in the CTR) for the protection of human health from the consumption of water and organisms would no longer apply to these water bodies. Thus, waste dischargers to these water bodies would not be required to reduce concentrations of constituents exceeding objectives and criteria for protection of MUN in these water bodies. Waste discharges to the water bodies would continue to be regulated to achieve water quality objectives/criteria for the remaining designated beneficial uses of the water bodies, and to not cause exceedance of applicable objectives/criteria in downstream waters, including criteria/objectives for protection of MUN where that use remains a designated use. Approval of the proposed change to the Basin Plan would not change flows, surface water elevations, or water quality in these water bodies relative to existing conditions, because POTW and agricultural discharge quantity and quality would remain similar to existing conditions following adoption of the proposed Basin Plan amendment. The proposed Basin Plan amendment would not create, emit, or expose people to new or more hazardous materials. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan amendment would have <b>no impact</b> on hazards and hazardous materials.</p>				
<b>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the Project:</b>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES	<i>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>NO IMPACT</i>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 that results in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 that 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"/>

**Discussion:** The removal of MUN as a designated beneficial use of specific water bodies in the Willows, Colusa, Biggs, and Live Oak subareas of the Sacramento River Basin would mean that State water quality objectives for protection of drinking water and federal water quality criteria (defined in the CTR) for the protection of human health from the consumption of water and organisms would no longer apply to these water bodies. Thus, waste dischargers to these water bodies would not be required to reduce

ISSUES	<i>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>NO IMPACT</i>
<p>concentrations of constituents exceeding objectives and criteria for protection of MUN in these water bodies. Waste discharges to the water bodies would continue to be regulated to achieve water quality objectives/criteria for the remaining designated beneficial uses of the water bodies, and to not cause exceedance of applicable objectives/criteria in downstream waters, including criteria/objectives for protection of MUN where that use remains a designated use. Approval of the proposed change to the Basin Plan would not change flows, surface water elevations, or water quality in these water bodies relative to existing conditions, because POTW and agricultural discharge quantity and quality would remain similar to existing conditions following adoption of the proposed Basin Plan amendment. Therefore, there would be no degradation of water quality relative to existing conditions or effect on surface water or groundwater hydrology. Overall, the proposed Basin Plan amendment would have <b>no impact</b> on hydrology and water quality.</p>				
<p><b>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the Project:</b></p>				
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 for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>
<p><u>Discussion:</u> The removal of MUN as a designated beneficial use of specific water bodies in the Willows, Colusa, Biggs, and Live Oak subareas of the Sacramento River Basin would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation, or any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan amendment would have <b>no impact</b> on land uses and planning.</p>				
<p><b>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the Project:</b></p>				
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>ISSUES</b>	<i>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>NO IMPACT</i>
plan or other land use plan?				
<p><u>Discussion:</u> The removal of MUN as a designated beneficial use of specific water bodies in the Willows, Colusa, Biggs, and Live Oak subareas of the Sacramento River Basin would not result in the loss of availability of mineral resources, as the proposed Basin Plan amendment would not result in any ground disturbance. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan amendment would have <b>no impact</b> on mineral resources.</p>				
<b>XII. NOISE. Would the Project result in:</b>				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES	<i>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>NO IMPACT</i>
--------	---	---	---	----------------------

Discussion: The removal of MUN as a designated beneficial use of specific water bodies in the Willows, Colusa, Biggs, and Live Oak subareas of the Sacramento River Basin would mean that State water quality objectives for protection of drinking water and federal water quality criteria (defined in the CTR) for the protection of human health from the consumption of water and organisms would no longer apply to these water bodies. Thus, waste dischargers to these water bodies would not be required to reduce concentrations of constituents exceeding objectives and criteria for protection of MUN in these water bodies. Waste discharges to the water bodies would continue to be regulated to achieve water quality objectives/criteria for the remaining designated beneficial uses of the water bodies, and to not cause exceedance of applicable objectives/criteria in downstream waters, including criteria/objectives for protection of MUN where that use remains a designated use. Approval of the proposed change to the Basin Plan would not change flows, surface water elevations, or water quality in these water bodies relative to existing conditions, because POTW and agricultural discharge quantity and quality would remain similar to existing conditions following adoption of the proposed Basin Plan amendment. Because there would be no physical change to the environment, the proposed change to the Basin Plan would not create or expose any persons to additional noise. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan amendment would have **no impact** on noise.

**XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the Project:**

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"/>

ISSUES	<i>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>NO IMPACT</i>
--------	---	---	---	----------------------

Discussion: The removal of MUN as a designated beneficial use of specific water bodies in the Willows, Colusa, Biggs, and Live Oak subareas of the Sacramento River Basin would mean that State water quality objectives for protection of drinking water and federal water quality criteria (defined in the CTR) for the protection of human health from the consumption of water and organisms would no longer apply to these water bodies. The proposed Basin Plan amendment does not grant the POTWs discharging to these water bodies additional discharge capacity, thus, the proposed amendment would not induce population growth either directly or indirectly. Further, the proposed Basin Plan amendment does not displace housing or people. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan amendment would have **no impact** on population and housing.

**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:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>ISSUES</b>	<i>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>NO IMPACT</i>
---------------	---	---	---	----------------------

Discussion: The removal of MUN as a designated beneficial use of specific water bodies in the Willows, Colusa, Biggs, and Live Oak subareas of the Sacramento River Basin would mean that State water quality objectives for protection of drinking water and federal water quality criteria (defined in the CTR) for the protection of human health from the consumption of water and organisms would no longer apply to these water bodies. Thus, POTWs discharging to these water bodies would not be required to construct additional treatment processes to reduce concentrations of constituents exceeding objectives and criteria for protection of MUN in these water bodies. The proposed Basin Plan amendment would not result in the need to construct or modify any governmental facilities in order to provide continued, suitable public services. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan amendment would have **no impact** on public services.

**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"/>

Discussion: The removal of MUN as a designated beneficial use of specific water bodies in the Willows, Colusa, Biggs, and Live Oak subareas of the Sacramento River Basin would mean that State water quality objectives for protection of drinking water and federal water quality criteria (defined in the CTR) for the protection of human health from the consumption of water and organisms would no longer apply to these water bodies. The proposed Basin Plan amendment does not grant the POTWs discharging to these water bodies additional discharge capacity, thus, the proposed Basin Plan amendment does not affect population or housing, and thus would not increase the use of recreational facilities or require construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan amendment would have **no impact** on recreation.

ISSUES	<i>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>NO IMPACT</i>
--------	---	---	---	----------------------

**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 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 change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 of safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The removal of MUN as a designated beneficial use of specific water bodies in the Willows, Colusa, Biggs, and Live Oak subareas of the Sacramento River Basin would mean that State water quality objectives for protection of drinking water and federal water quality criteria (defined in the CTR) for the protection of human health from the consumption of water and organisms would no longer apply to these water bodies. The proposed Basin Plan amendment does not grant the POTWs discharging to these water bodies additional discharge capacity that would induce growth, thus, the proposed Basin Plan amendment would not change traffic, or result in incompatible uses or inadequate access or parking, or conflict with

ISSUES	<i>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>NO IMPACT</i>
adopted transportation policies, plans, or programs. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan amendment would have <b>no impact</b> on transportation/traffic.				
<b>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the Project:</b>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
<b>Discussion:</b> The removal of MUN as a designated beneficial use of specific water bodies in the Willows, Colusa, Biggs, and Live Oak subareas of the Sacramento River Basin would mean that State water quality objectives for protection of drinking water and federal water quality criteria (defined in the CTR) for the protection of human health from the consumption of water and organisms would no longer apply to these water bodies. Thus, POTWs and agricultural discharges to these water bodies would not be required to				

ISSUES	<i>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>NO IMPACT</i>
<p>reduce concentrations of constituents exceeding objectives and criteria for protection of MUN in these water bodies. Waste discharges would continue to be regulated to achieve water quality standards for the remaining designated beneficial uses of the affected water bodies, and would not be permitted to cause exceedance of water quality standards in downstream water bodies that have beneficial use designations that are not affected by the proposed Basin Plan amendment. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan amendment would not cause exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements of the Central Valley Water Board. The proposed Basin Plan amendment would not affect storm water drainage facilities, require additional water supplies, require additional wastewater treatment capacity, affect landfill services, or be in noncompliance with solid waste statutes and regulations. Overall, the proposed Basin Plan amendment would have <b>no impact</b> on utilities and service systems.</p>				
<p><b>XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b></p>				
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>c) Does the Project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Discussion:</u> The removal of MUN as a designated beneficial use of specific water bodies in the Willows, Colusa, Biggs, and Live Oak subareas of the Sacramento River Basin would mean that State water quality objectives for protection of drinking water and federal water quality criteria (defined in the CTR) for the</p>				

<b>ISSUES</b>	<i>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED</i>	<i>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</i>	<i>NO IMPACT</i>
<p>protection of human health from the consumption of water and organisms would no longer apply to these water bodies. As a result, POTWs and agricultural discharges to these water bodies would not be required to reduce concentrations of constituents exceeding objectives and criteria for protection of MUN in these water bodies, and discharge quality would be similar to existing conditions. Thus, there would be no further degradation to water quality relative to existing conditions.</p> <p>With the proposed Basin Plan amendment, there would be no change to the biological resources-related beneficial use designations (e.g., WARM, COLD, WILD, BIOL, RARE, MIGR, SPWN) of the affected water bodies and water quality objectives for protection of these uses would continue to apply. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan amendment would not reduce the quality or quantity of habitat for any 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.</p> <p>The proposed Basin Plan amendment would not cause any cumulatively considerable impacts. Future discharges to the water bodies no longer designated with the MUN beneficial use as a result of the amendment would be required to comply with State water quality objectives and federal water quality criteria for protection of all applicable designated beneficial uses. Further, the discharges must comply with all relevant water quality objectives as required by the Central Valley Water Board. POTWs requiring an increased discharge capacity in the future to accommodate planned and approved growth in the region will need to prepare an antidegradation analysis for the Central Valley Water Board, and receive approval from the Central Valley Water Board, through an NPDES permit modification, for any future expanded discharge capacity discharge. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan amendment itself would not cause cumulatively considerable impacts in the receiving waters or downstream waters of the Sacramento River Basin.</p> <p>No longer having MUN as a designated beneficial use of specific water bodies in the Willows, Colusa, Biggs, and Live Oak subareas of the Sacramento River Basin would not cause substantial adverse effects on humans directly or indirectly. Investigations of these water bodies found that these water bodies were constructed and/or modified for the purpose of conveying or holding agricultural drainage waters, not for MUN supply, as described in the four water body characterization reports (Biggs 2014, Colusa 2014, Live Oak 2014 and Willows 2014). Further, investigations found that these water bodies have not historically been used for MUN supply (Biggs 2014, Colusa 2014, Live Oak 2014 and Willows 2014). Criteria for protection of other beneficial uses of these water bodies, as well as downstream water bodies where MUN is and would remain a designated use, would continue to apply, including criteria for protection of humans from consumption of water and organisms and organisms only.</p> <p>Additional discussion of the proposed Basin Plan amendment relative to the cumulative condition and protection of downstream beneficial uses, including downstream MUN uses not affected by the proposed Basin Plan amendment, is provided in Section 7.1.4 of the Staff Report.</p>				

## Preliminary Staff Determination

On the basis of this evaluation and staff report, which collectively provide the required information:

- 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.

Note: Authority cited: Section 21082, Public Resources Code. Reference: Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21080.5, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151, Public Resources Code; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino*, 202 Cal.App.3d 296 (1988); and *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors*, 222 Cal.App.3d 1337 (1990).