

Attachment 9. Appendix L – Environmental Checklist

APPENDIX L— ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

California Environmental Quality Act Requirements

The Central Valley Water Board, as a Lead Agency under CEQA (Pub. Res. Code, § 21000 et seq.), is responsible for evaluating all the potential environmental impacts that may occur due to changes made to the Basin Plans. 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 is exempt from the requirement to prepare an environmental impact report for basin planning activities. Instead, this Staff Report and the Environmental Checklist (Appendix L) satisfy the applicable CEQA requirements.

1. Project title:

Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins, and the Water Quality Control Plan for the Tulare Lake Basin to Establish a Region-wide Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN) Beneficial Use Evaluation Process in Agriculturally Dominated Surface Water Bodies

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

4. Project location:

The project is located within the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake Basins, in the Central Valley.

5. Description of project:

The Central Valley Water Board is proposing amendments to the Basin Plan to: 1) establish a region-wide regulatory process for evaluating appropriate application of and level of protection for the Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN) beneficial use in agriculturally (Ag) dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins, 2) re-designation of the MUN beneficial use in certain types of Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems to a new beneficial use Limited MUN, and 4) apply this process and de-designate the MUN beneficial use from specified Ag dominated surface water bodies within the San Luis Canal Company (SLCC) service area, located within the San Joaquin River Basin.

The proposed Basin Plan Amendments would add a standardized region-wide process to the Basin Plans that would guide the Central Valley Water Board's evaluation of appropriate MUN or limited MUN beneficial use designations and associated water quality objectives in Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems, creation of a water quality objective associated with the limited MUN beneficial use, and would set implementation provisions related to this process. The amendments are based on a water body categorization approach, which distinguishes between those water bodies that have been constructed or modified to convey Ag drainage (C1, M1), those water bodies that have been constructed or modified to convey Ag supply water (C2, M2), natural water bodies dominated by agricultural operations (B1, B2), and those water bodies encompassed in a permanent or seasonal closed controlled recirculating system. The amendment proposes to utilize, where appropriate, Sources of

~~Drinking Water Policy Exception to de-designate the MUN beneficial use. The proposed amendments~~

~~Draft Staff Report~~

~~MUN Process~~

Commented [A1]: Comments are provided below from the Sacramento River Source Water Protection Program (SRSWPP).

Commented [A2]: We are concerned that the Staff Report and Environmental Checklist (Appendix L) provide insufficient environmental, economic, and antidegradation evaluations for protection of downstream MUN use.

Commented [A3]: Our understanding is that the level of protection coverage in this BPA is related to the LMUN Beneficial use, and that no changes are proposed to protection of the MUN use. If level of protection of MUN within MUN water bodies being used or planned for MUN use is being considered, this is a significant new issue.

Commented [A4]: We recommend that this sentence be clarified, as reconsideration of water quality objectives for MUN was not a stated purpose of the process of development of this BPA.

would also establish a "Limited Municipal and Domestic Supply" (LMUN) beneficial use for

Ag dominated water bodies that do not meet the Sources of Drinking Water Policy exceptions, but that have inherent limiting conditions, such as low or intermittent flows and/or elevated natural background constituent concentrations.

Application of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments to Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems where MUN is currently a designated beneficial use would result in one of three outcomes for the water bodies evaluated through this process: 1) existing MUN designation remains in place; 2) existing MUN designation is de-designated; or 3) the existing MUN designation is refined-revised with a LMUN use re-designation. The resulting changes in applicable water quality objectives for each scenario are described below.

- 1) Under Scenario #1, State water quality objectives for protection of drinking water (such as the primary and secondary maximum contaminant levels [and various narrative water quality objectives with regards to the MUN beneficial use](#)) 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 continue to apply to the evaluated Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins (where currently applicable), and, thus there would be no change relative to existing conditions.
- 2) Under Scenario #2, the removal of MUN as a designated beneficial use of evaluated Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins [that are approved for de-designation](#) 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 (where applicable) would no longer apply to these water bodies. Thus, waste discharges from facilities such as POTWs, agricultural operations, and storm water outfalls to these water bodies would not be required to protect the MUN beneficial use in the immediate receiving water. However, discharges to the Ag dominated surface water bodies without the MUN beneficial use designation would continue to be required to meet the water quality objectives/criteria for any remaining applicable 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 designated.
- 3) Under Scenario #3, the refinement of the MUN use designation to a [re-designation to LMUN use](#) for evaluated Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins [that are approved for re-designation](#) 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 (where currently applicable) would no longer apply to these water bodies. The numeric MUN-related objectives and criteria would be replaced with a narrative water quality objective requiring water quality within and downstream beneficial uses to be protected consistent with the state antidegradation policy. Discharges to the Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems without the MUN beneficial use designation would continue to be required to meet the water quality objectives/criteria for any remaining applicable 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 designated.

The second component of the proposed Basin Plan Amendment project is to apply this MUN evaluation process to Ag dominated surface water bodies within the SLCC service area, which is located in the San Joaquin River Basin. SLCC identified 232 water bodies in its service area, comprising 391 channel miles. One of SLCC's listed water bodies, Salt Slough, is a natural, modified water body and is specifically identified in Table II-1 of the Basin Plan with no MUN designated beneficial use. Thus, Salt Slough was not subject to any further MUN evaluation as part of these Basin Plan Amendments. The remaining 231 water bodies were evaluated using the proposed MUN evaluation process and were all found to be constructed channels with the exception of Poso Slough, which is a modified natural channel. Since they all meet Exception 2B of the Sources of Drinking Water Policy, these Basin Plan Amendments proposes

Commented [A5]: We request that the definition of LMUN be further considered to clarify support of the intended LMUN beneficial use.

Commented [A6]: We request that this first potential outcome be further developed throughout the process.

Commented [A7]: Please include other types of discharges.

Commented [A8]: It is important to prevent degradation of water quality and impacts to downstream MUN. This is supported by the Regional Board's Delta Drinking Water Policy

Commented [A9]: This is not consistent with state and federal antidegradation policies. Moreover, protection of MUN use should not allow degradation up to the MCLs and should prevent trends of degradation for numerical as well as narrative WQOs applicable to MUN. Change in water quality can result in public health and welfare risk and increased water treatment and residual management costs, along with environmental effects if there's the need for additional treatment processes and facilities.

Commented [A10]: What will be the status of the narrative water quality objectives in the Basin Plans that also apply to drinking water (along with other beneficial uses?)

Commented [A11]: It is important to prevent degradation of water quality and impacts to downstream MUN. This is supported by the Regional Board's Delta Drinking Water Policy

Commented [A12]: This is not consistent with state and federal antidegradation policies. Moreover, protection of MUN use should not allow degradation up to the MCLs and should prevent trends of degradation for numerical and narrative WQOs. Change in water quality can result in public health and welfare risk and increased water treatment and residual management costs, along with environmental effects if there's the need for additional treatment processes and facilities.

Commented [A13]: Please clarify how the SLCC water bodies met the sources of drinking water policy exception, which is based on primary use for drainage. Please clarify how this was determined and defined. We are providing these comments as constructive input on the general process aspect of the BPA, not specifically on the SLCC area.

to remove their MUN designation. With adoption and approval of the amendment, state water quality objectives for protection of drinking water (~~i.e.~~ drinking water maximum contaminant levels and applicable narrative standards with regards to drinking water MUN beneficial use) and CTR

criteria for the protection of human health from the consumption of water and organisms would no longer apply to the SLCC water bodies, where MUN is currently a designated use.

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	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
I. AESTHETICS. Would the Project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

Discussion:

Addressed below are the impacts to aesthetics from adoption and approval of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments that would: 1) define a regulatory process to evaluate MUN beneficial use designations in Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins; and 2) de-designate MUN from specified water bodies within the SLCC service area.

- a) The result of de-designating MUN from specified water bodies in the SLCC service area, and the refinement of MUN to LMUN or de-designation of MUN from additional Ag dominated water bodies or closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins through application of the MUN evaluation process, would be that discharges would no longer be required to reduce concentrations of constituents that may currently have the potential to exceed objectives/criteria for protection of MUN in these water bodies. Where aesthetics of natural or modified channels may be of concern to the public and affect a scenic vista, discharges would continue to be regulated to achieve water quality objectives/criteria for protection of the remaining beneficial uses of these water bodies, including biological- and recreation-related uses, as applicable. Discharges to Ag dominated water bodies and within recirculating systems also would continue to be regulated to achieve water quality objectives/criteria for protection of beneficial uses of downstream water bodies. Further, the proposed amendment does not involve construction; thus, its adoption and implementation do not involve placement of structures or other visual obstructions in the vicinity of Ag dominated surface water bodies. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have no impact on a scenic vista.
- b) As described above in “a,” the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would not result in the placement of structures in the vicinity of the Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have no impact on scenic resources.
- c) As described above in “a,” discharges would continue to be regulated to achieve water quality objectives/criteria for protection of all other designated uses of Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems to which the MUN evaluation process would be applied in the future and the evaluated water bodies within the SLCC that are a component of these Basin Plan Amendments. This includes objectives for biostimulatory substances, dissolved oxygen, floating material, and suspended material, which relate to the aesthetics of a water body, as applicable. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have no impact on the

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
existing visual character or quality of Ag dominated surface water bodies or closed controlled recirculating systems and their surroundings. d) As described above in "a," the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would not result in the placement of structures in the vicinity of Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on day or nighttime views in the areas affected.				
II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. 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. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: Addressed below are the impacts to <u>agricultural resources</u> from adoption and approval of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments that would: 1) define a regulatory process to evaluate MUN beneficial use designations in Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins; and 2) de-designate MUN from specified water bodies within the SLCC service area. a) With the proposed Basin Plan Amendments, there would be no change to the relevant agricultural				

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>beneficial use (AGR) designation of any water bodies to which the MUN evaluation process would be applied, including the specified water bodies within the SLCC, and water quality objectives for protection of the AGR use would continue to apply. Further, the proposed amendment is not a land use action involving the conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural use. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on farmland conversion to a non-agricultural use.</p> <p>b) As described above for “a,” the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would not involve the conversion of agricultural land to another use. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on existing agricultural use zoning of a Williamson Act contract.</p> <p>c) As described above for “a,” the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would not involve the conversion of agricultural land to another use. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on existing zoning of forest land or timberland.</p> <p>d) As described above for “a,” the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would not involve the conversion of agricultural land to another use. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on forest land to a non-forest use.</p> <p>e) As described above for “a,” there would be no change to the relevant agricultural beneficial use (AGR) designation of any water bodies to which the MUN evaluation process would be applied and water quality objectives for protection of the AGR use would continue to apply. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on farmland or forest land related to changes in the existing environment.</p>				
<p>III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the Project:</p>				
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"/>
<p>Discussion: Addressed below are the impacts to <u>air quality</u> from adoption and approval of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments that would: 1) define a regulatory process to evaluate MUN beneficial use designations in Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins; and 2) de-designate MUN from specified water bodies within the</p>				

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
SLCC service area.				
<p>a,b,c,d) The removal or refinement of the MUN use designation for Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems would have no effect on air quality relative to existing conditions. With the exception of volatile organic compounds, which volatilize to the atmosphere, constituents in discharges remain within the water body to which they are discharged. The most common volatile organic compounds present in Central Valley discharges are trihalomethane compounds (THMs) from POTW's utilizing a chlorine disinfection treatment process. The CTR contains criteria for protection of human health from consumption of water and organisms for three THMs (bromoform, dibromochloromethane, and dichlorobromomethane). These CTR criteria would no longer apply if the MUN use is removed or re-designated <u>finee</u> to LMUN for certain water bodies (i.e., modified or natural water bodies). The result would be that POTW's with THMs present in the discharge would continue to do so, though concentrations would be regulated relative to the CTR organisms only criteria. Those POTW's that have invested in processes to reduce THMs (e.g., through implementation of ultraviolet disinfection) would be expected to continue using such systems given the investment and infrastructure in place. In both circumstances, there would be expected to be no increase in discharge concentrations of THMs from POTW's as a result of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments, and thus no change in volatilization of compounds into the air relative to existing conditions. Storm water and agricultural discharges are not typical dischargers of volatile organic compounds, and thus there would be no changes from existing conditions relative to volatilization of organic compounds in these discharges. Further, where dischargers are contemplating future projects to come into compliance MUN-related objectives/criteria, there would be no need to construct treatment processes or implement management efforts, which may have air quality impact associated with equipment or vehicle use. Finally, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments do not permit additional capacity to dischargers that would induce population growth or would result in construction activities that could contribute air pollutants. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on consistency with an air quality plan, attainment of air quality standards, cumulatively considerable net increases of a pollutant in a non-attainment region, or exposure of sensitive receptors to pollutants.</p> <p>e) With the proposed Basin Plan Amendments, water quality objectives/criteria for protection of all other designated uses of Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems to which the MUN evaluation process would be applied in the future or the evaluated water bodies within the SLCC as part of this amendment would remain applicable. This includes objectives for biostimulatory substances, dissolved oxygen, floating material, suspended material, and odor, which relate to the potential for a water body to produce objectionable odors (e.g., through decay of organic matter). Further, as described above, the proposed amendment does not permit additional capacity to dischargers that may contribute to additional odor-producing processes beyond existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on the creation of objectionable odors.</p>				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Addressed below are the impacts to biological resources from adoption and approval of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments that would: 1) define a regulatory process to evaluate MUN beneficial use designations, and de-designate or refine the MUN use where appropriate, in Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins; and 2) de-designate the MUN use from specified water bodies within the SLCC service area.

- a) Removal of the MUN beneficial use designation from the evaluated SLCC service area water bodies would not result in changes to water quality and flows of those water bodies relative to existing conditions. Through implementation of the Central Valley Water Board's Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, MUN-based water quality objectives are currently incorporated into the waste discharge requirements (WDRs) of grower coalitions as limits that trigger development of a Surface Water Quality Management Plan to address constituents with concentrations elevated relative to the limits. SLCC is a member of the Westside San Joaquin River Watershed Coalition (Coalition), which is regulated by WDRs Order R5-2014-0002. The WDRs list MUN-based limits for surface waters for: fecal coliform, electrical conductivity (EC), copper, lead, nitrate, nitrite, selenium, simazine, total dissolved solids (TDS), and zinc. Of these constituents, copper, lead, selenium, and zinc also have aquatic life toxicity-based limits; these limits are lower than the MUN-based limits. Because the biological-related beneficial use designations would be unchanged by the proposed amendment, WDRs would continue to require achieving aquatic life-based water quality objectives/criteria, where they apply. WDRs also would continue to require monitoring and address of aquatic life protection.

The Coalition has developed the Central Valley Water Board-approved Westside Management

Commented [A14]: Please clarify throughout if this discussion applies to both dedesignation of MUN and redesignation to LMUN, as there are parts that only include dedesignation. This is an important point and has implications towards antidegradation and potential water quality impacts.

Commented [A15]: Comments on item a) are meant as constructive input on the overall process and implications for the Sacramento River watershed and source water protection of the Sacramento and American Rivers.

Commented [A16]: How will the ILRP continue to provide the necessary monitoring and implementation to support protection of downstream MUN use?

Commented [A17]: Please clarify that if there are downstream MUN water bodies and how they will be protected for water quality constituents for which the human health levels are lower than those applicable to aquatic life protection.

Commented [A18]: This sentence implies that WDRs would not continue to require monitoring for downstream MUN protection. This seems to contradict portions of the process that discuss evaluation of existing monitoring programs and monitoring data, as well as monitoring under the surveillance and monitoring long-term program.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>Plan (October 2008) to address exceedance of the limits in the WDRs that trigger the requirement for such a plan. The Westside Management Plan addresses aquatic toxicity, sediment, salinity, <i>E. coli</i>, and dissolved oxygen, and identifies tiered priorities and schedules for addressing these constituents. The coalition has focused on Tier 1 priorities, which include aquatic toxicity, pesticides, sediment toxicity, and sediment discharge, in accordance with focused Management Plans for Ingram and Hospital Creeks (October 2008) and Poso Slough and Salt Slough (September 2011), though it continues to also address other constituents in the plan. These activities and related SLCC operations would remain unchanged with de-designation of MUN from the SLCC water bodies. Consequently, water quality and flows in SLCC service area water bodies would be unaffected by the proposed amendment and thus there would be <u>no impact</u> to candidate, sensitive, or special status species.</p> <p>Additional Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems elsewhere in the Central Valley Region that may have the MUN use de-designated (due to the proposed amendments) similarly would retain biological resource-related beneficial uses (e.g., WARM, COLD, WILD, BIOL, RARE, MIGR, SPWN) and associated water quality objectives, where applicable. Thus, the removal of the MUN beneficial use designation would not contribute to adverse chemical conditions to aquatic life. Agricultural discharge patterns, and thus receiving water flow conditions, could potentially change somewhat, relative to existing conditions, due to de-designation of MUN. The degree of change would depend on the degree to which dischargers are currently implementing best management practices (e.g., minimizing discharges by maximizing recirculation) to meet MUN-related objectives. However, because other factors also drive agricultural operations (e.g., available water supply), the de-designation of MUN from additional Ag dominated water bodies or closed controlled recirculating systems would be expected to have little to no effect on operations (as is expected to be the case with SLCC discussed above), and thus flows in these water bodies. Regardless, the water flows in the Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems as affected by agricultural operations would continue to be highly managed as they are under existing conditions. The rate of storm water and POTW discharges are primarily dependent on the physical area served and capacity of the systems, and thus discharge patterns to Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems would be unaffected by the Basin Plan Amendments. As such, aquatic habitat physical and chemical conditions of importance to biological resources, including species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species, would be similar to existing conditions following adoption and implementation of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments. Any minor changes that may potentially occur in the physical and chemical conditions of Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems as a result of adopting and implementing the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would result in <u>less-than-significant impacts</u> to candidate, sensitive, or special status species.</p> <p>b,c,d) As described for “a” above, aquatic habitat physical (e.g., flow, temperature, dissolved oxygen) and chemical conditions (i.e., water quality conditions) of importance to biological resources, including riparian habitats, other sensitive natural communities and wetlands, would be similar to existing conditions following adoption and implementation of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments. Thus, there would be a <u>less than significant impact</u> to riparian habitat, other sensitive natural communities, wetlands, and the movement of native and migratory fish and wildlife.</p> <p>e,f) There would be no change to the existing biological resources-related beneficial use designations (e.g., WARM, COLD, WILD, BIOL, RARE, MIGR, SPWN) of Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare</p>				

Commented [A19]: This statement seems to imply that the ILRP WDRs would no longer require best management practices to protect downstream MUN use. This has potential to cause significant degradation, and would be a major change to the ILRP program.

Commented [A20]: Please include other types of discharges.

Commented [A21]: There was insufficient evaluation to support that there would only potentially be minor changes in the chemical conditions.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
Lake basins and water quality objectives for protection of these uses would continue to apply to protect these uses. Therefore, there would be <u>no impact</u> associated with local policies, ordinances, or conservation plans protecting 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"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Addressed below are the impacts to cultural resources from adoption and approval of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments that would: 1) define a regulatory process to evaluate MUN beneficial use designations in Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins; and 2) de-designate MUN from specified water bodies within the SLCC service area.</p> <p>a,b,c,d) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments do not permit additional capacity to dischargers that would induce population growth or would result in construction activities, or would contribute to additional flows in receiving waters. Therefore, there would be <u>no impact</u> to historical, archaeological and paleontological resources, geological features, and human remains.</p>				
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"/>

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Addressed below are the impacts to geology and soils from adoption and approval of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments that would: 1) define a regulatory process to evaluate MUN beneficial use designations in Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins; and 2) de-designate MUN from specified water bodies within the SLCC service area.</p> <p>a) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments do not directly result in physical changes to the landscape or placement of structures on soil and thus would have <u>no impact</u> on the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects involving fault lines, seismic-related ground shaking and failure, and landslides.</p> <p>b) As described in “a” of Biological Resources, there may be some change in agricultural operations relative to reuse of water. However, the Basin Plan Amendments would not directly result in the modification of agricultural operations relative to crops grown or soil management practices. Thus, there would be a <u>no impact</u> to soil erosion and loss of topsoil.</p> <p>c,d) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments would not directly result in physical changes to the landscape or placement of structures on soil and thus would have <u>no impact</u> on the potential for landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse to occur, or be located on expansive soil.</p> <p>e) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments would not directly result in the placement of structures requiring disposal of wastewater to land and, thus, would have <u>no impact</u> on soils incapable of supporting septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.</p>				
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the Project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Commented [A22]: Please include consideration of whether the BPA may result in changes to the ILRP WDRs that could result in reduced protection to downstream beneficial uses from upstream soil erosion.

Commented [A23]: Please include other types of discharges.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
greenhouse gases?				
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Addressed below are the impacts to <u>greenhouse gas emissions</u> from adoption and approval of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments that would: 1) define a regulatory process to evaluate MUN beneficial use designations in Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins; and 2) de-designate MUN from specified water bodies within the SLCC service area.</p> <p>a) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments do not permit additional capacity to dischargers that would induce population growth or would result in construction activities that could generate greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on consistency with an air quality plan, attainment of air quality standards, or pollutant exposure to sensitive receptors.</p> <p>b) The removal of MUN as a designated beneficial use, or re-designation placement with LMUN, where applicable <u>and upon review and approval</u>, of Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins is an action related to defining applicable water quality standards and, thus, would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation related to greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on greenhouse gas emissions.</p>				
<p>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the Project:</p>				
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 airstrip, would the Project result in a safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Commented [A24]: Please include consideration of the potential for downstream water quality degradation and the potential need for increased water treatment processes and facilities, as well as the potential for increased carbon footprint for transport or other management of water treatment residuals.

Commented [A25]: Please consider if the MUN de-designations or LMUN re-designations could result in changes in agricultural chemical transport, use, or disposal.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
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"/>

Discussion:

Addressed below are the impacts to hazards and hazardous materials from adoption and approval of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments that would: 1) define a regulatory process to evaluate MUN beneficial use designations in Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins; and 2) de-designate MUN from specified water bodies within the SLCC service area.

- a) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments do not permit additional capacity to dischargers that would induce population growth or would result in construction activities. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have no impact on the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.
- b) As described above for "a," the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would not result in the increased use of hazardous materials. Discharges to the Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems with the MUN beneficial use removed would still be regulated to achieve water quality objectives/criteria for the remaining beneficial uses of the water bodies, as well as downstream water bodies, including MUN where applicable. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have no impact on the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments are modification of water quality standards and does not involve construction of a project. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have no impact on the exposure of a school to hazardous materials or emissions.
- d) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments are modification of water quality standards and does not involve construction of a project. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have no impact on the exposure of the public or the environment to a significant hazard associated with hazardous materials located on a site.
- e,f) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments are modification of water quality standards and does not involve construction of a project. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have no impact on the exposure of people residing or working within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip to a safety hazard.
- g) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments are modification of water quality standards and does not involve construction of a project. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have no impact on an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- h) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments are modification of water quality standards and does not involve construction of a project. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have no impact on the exposure of people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

Commented [A26]: Should re-designated be added here? Or if not, should there be additional discussion to address re-designated LMUN water bodies and protection of downstream beneficial uses?

Commented [A27]: There should also be inclusion of development of a new beneficial use LMUN. If an LMUN water body's water is used as a water supply in the future, it would require treatment and residual management – this should be considered throughout the environmental review, and is just flagged in this location.

Commented [A28]: The same two comment above also apply here.

Commented [A29]: Same comment as above.

Commented [A30]: Same comment as above

Commented [A31]: Same comment as above.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the Project:				
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 support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures 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: Addressed below are the impacts to <u>hydrology and water quality</u> from adoption and approval of the Basin Plan Amendments that would: 1) define a regulatory process to evaluate MUN beneficial use				

Commented [A32]: We are focusing our review of water quality for surface water source water protection, as described in the comments below and in the other comments submitted; but some of the items in the checklist under Item IX may not be no impact for other considerations.

Commented [A33]: Please include the potential for new discharges and how water quality impacts would be mitigated, including long-term and cumulative.

Commented [A34]: The evaluation is insufficient to support this conclusion. It is unclear why no impact was selected here. There was insufficient evaluation of potential for water quality impacts, as well as insufficient problem identification that would have been a good starting place for some of the considerations for water quality impacts. Please consider if mitigation may be needed, or further describe how existing programs will ensure that downstream source water quality will be protected.

Commented [A35]: How will water quality changes for existing discharges be mitigated. Please especially consider how downstream MUN beneficial use will be protected after removal of MUN WQOs for receiving waters in permits and WDRs. Will this require additional mitigation?

Commented [A36]: Please consider if the MUN de-designations and LMUN re-designations could result in increased erosion.

Commented [A37]: We are concerned that this may not be a less than significant impact. There was insufficient problem identification and water quality evaluation to support a less than significant finding.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>designations, and de-designate or refine the MUN use or re-designate to a new LMUN beneficial where appropriate, in Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins; and 2) de-designate the MUN use from specified water bodies within the SLCC service area.</p> <p>a) With the Basin Plan Amendments, discharges to Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems would continue to be regulated to achieve water quality objectives/criteria for 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. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on compliance with water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.</p> <p>b) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments do not involve the construction of housing or other project that would rely on extraction of groundwater supplies, or would expand impervious area or otherwise cause interference of groundwater recharge. As described below for "f," an indirect result of the proposed amendment may be the ability for agricultural users to increase recycling and reuse of water within the Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems. Improved recycling of water has the potential to reduce demand on groundwater supplies. Therefore, the Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on groundwater supplies.</p> <p>c,d) The Basin Plan Amendments would not involve construction or induce construction that would cause alterations to a site, stream or river. Therefore, the Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on the drainage pattern or a site or area.</p> <p>e) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments do not involve construction of housing or structures. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would not result in the generation of additional storm water runoff and would have <u>no impact</u> on the capacity of existing or planned storm system.</p> <p>f) Removal of MUN as a designated use of Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems or , and redesignation placement with LMUN where applicable, would result in modifications to waste discharge requirements (WDRs) for POTW, agricultural, and storm water discharges to these water bodies, because the Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems with the MUN use removed would no longer have to comply with drinking water water quality objectives MCLs or CTR criteria for the protection of human health for the consumption of drinking water and organisms (where applicable). Discharges to the Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems 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. The resulting change in WDRs for POTWs is not expected to result in significant degradation to water quality. POTWs have fixed processes that provide a certain level of treatment and effluent quality based on those processes. As such, treatment at POTWs would not be reduced following MUN de- designation. Rather, POTWs that may have been investigating the need to construct additional treatment technologies to achieve MUN-based criteria/objectives would no longer pursue those investigations/upgrade projects. Storm water discharges also would be similar to existing conditions, as they are a function of BMPs, which provide overall control and treatment of storm water for a number of constituents of concern to all beneficial uses, including MUN, recreation, and biological uses (e.g., sediment, metals, bacteria), which would continue to be implemented according to approved storm water management plans. Thus, water quality degradation, as affected by POTW and storm water discharges, is not expected to occur with the proposed amendment. However, as further explained below, there could potentially be some water quality</p>				

- Commented [A38]:** It is important to prevent degradation of water quality and impacts to downstream MUN. This is supported by the Regional Board's Delta Drinking Water Policy
- Commented [A39]:** It is not clear how downstream MUN use will continue to be protected after MUN WQOs are removed from permits and WDRs. Will monitoring continue to be required and management practices to protect downstream MUN?
- Commented [A40]:** This is not consistent with state and federal antidegradation policies. Moreover, protection of MUN use should not allow degradation up to the MCLs and should prevent trends of degradation for numerical and narrative WQOs. Change in water quality can result in public health and welfare risk and increased water treatment and residual management costs, along with environmental effects if there's the need for additional treatment processes and facilities.
- Commented [A41]:** It is unclear how there would be no impacts, without there being a sufficient problem statement and water quality evaluations.
- Commented [A42]:** There may be potential for the need for increased water treatment processes and facilities, and residual management. For water supplies in the future that may be permitted for use of LMUN water bodies, advanced treatment may be necessary beyond what currently may needed if the LMUN water quality is allowed to degrade.
- Commented [A43]:** Please include other types of discharges.
- Commented [A44]:** There are numerical and narrative water quality objectives that apply to MUN.
- Commented [A45]:** Please consider if removal of the MUN WQOs presents risk of water quality impacts to downstream MUN use, and how those risks will be mitigated.
- Commented [A46]:** It is important to prevent degradation of water quality and impacts to downstream MUN. This is supported by the Regional Board's Delta Drinking Water Policy.
- Commented [A47]:** This is not consistent with state and federal antidegradation policies. Moreover, protection of MUN use should not allow degradation up to the MCLs and should prevent trends of degradation for numerical and narrative WQOs. Change in water quality can result in public health and welfare risk and increased water treatment and residual management costs, along with environmental effects if there's the need for additional treatment processes and facilities.
- Commented [A48]:** Information should be included if there are current problems that will receive regulatory relief from this BPA, as this is important to have adequate evaluation of environmental impacts as well as for development of the process.
- Commented [A49]:** Please include other types of discharges in the environmental review.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>MUN-based water quality objectives/criteria.</p> <p>As discussed above in "a" under Biological Resources, removal of the MUN beneficial use designation from the evaluated SLCC service area water bodies would not result in changes to flows of those water bodies relative to existing conditions because current agricultural operations are not anticipated to change with adoption of the Basin Plan Amendments. Further, the discharges would still be regulated to achieve water quality objectives for protection of aquatic life. However, SLCC water bodies would no longer have to meet MUN-based limits for fecal coliform, EC, nitrate, nitrite, and TDS, though discharges would have to address protection of MUN in downstream waters where MUN would remain a designated beneficial use. As discussed above in "a" of Biological Resources, through implementation of the Westside Management Plan and focused management, the focus of water quality management efforts has been addressing aquatic toxicity, pesticides, sediment toxicity, and sediment discharge. To address salinity, a MUN constituent of concern, the Westside Management Plan strategy is to support and participate in related Central Valley Water Board programs, including the TMDL for salinity and boron for the San Joaquin River and the CV-SALTS initiative. These activities and related SLCC operations would remain unchanged with de-designation of MUN from the SLCC water bodies. Consequently, water quality and flows in SLCC service area water bodies would be unaffected by the proposed amendment and thus there would be <u>no impact</u> with regard to water quality degradation in SLCC water bodies.</p> <p>Additional Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems that may have the MUN use de-designated through application of the MUN evaluation process portion of the Basin Plan Amendments similarly would no longer be required to achieve objectives/criteria for protection of MUN in these water bodies. However, discharges to water bodies with MUN de-designated would still not be permitted to cause exceedance of water quality objectives/criteria in downstream waters where MUN would remain a designated beneficial use and objectives/criteria for other designated uses (e.g., biological resources-related uses). In establishing WDRs for these discharges, the Central Valley Water Board would continue to consider the degree to which any water quality degradation should be allowed relative to effects on these downstream beneficial uses, and water body specific uses, by making findings regarding the consistency of the issued WDRs with the state's Antidegradation Policy (SWRCB Resolution No. 68-16).</p> <p>In summary, while there could be some water quality degradation in Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems where the MUN use is de-designated or refined to LMUN, particularly associated with salinity-related parameters, WDRs regulating these discharges would contain requirements that would not permit degradation that would allow exceedance of water quality objectives/criteria applicable to the water body itself or any constituents, including MUN-related constituents, in downstream waters where MUN remains a designated beneficial use. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have a <u>less than significant impact</u> with regard to water quality degradation.</p> <p>g,h) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments do not involve construction of housing or structures. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on the placement of housing or structures in a 100-year flood hazard area.</p> <p>i) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments do not involve the modification of the construction of levees or dams or involve construction of facilities within a floodplain. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on the exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding.</p> <p>j) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments do not involve construction of housing or structures. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on the inundation of areas</p>				

Commented [A50]: Are there some missing words in this sentence? I.e., was it meant to state that there could be some MUN-based water quality impacts?

Commented [A51]: See comments above on Biological Resources.

Commented [A52]: It is important to prevent degradation of water quality and impacts to downstream MUN. This is supported by the Regional Board's Delta Drinking Water Policy

Commented [A53]: This is not consistent with state and federal antidegradation policies. Moreover, protection of MUN use should not allow degradation up to the MCLs and should prevent trends of degradation for numerical and narrative WQOs. Change in water quality can result in public health and welfare risk and increased water treatment and residual management costs, along with environmental effects if there's the need for additional treatment processes and facilities.

Commented [A54]: This language is concerning, as it appears that the approach of the Regional Board is focused on allowing degradation, rather than supporting protection of source water quality. This is not consistent with the Delta Drinking Water Policy which recognizes the multi-barrier approach. We understand that there may be the need to consider allowing degradation in conjunction with all of the requirements in the antidegradation policy; however, there should be language included throughout the Regional Board's materials to indicate commitment to protecting the MUN use, which is not consistent will allowing degradation up to MCLs.

Commented [A55]: Further consideration is needed as to the potential risks and impacts of water quality degradation.

Commented [A56]: Please also clarify if monitoring programs would support prevention of impacts to downstream MUN use, and please add language to ensure that water quality for downstream MUN use will be protected, including from trends of degradation. E.g., the current ILRP order for the Sacramento River Watershed has the following Surface Water Limitations, including prevention of trend of degradations that may threaten or unreasonably affect BUs or cause or contribute to a condition of pollution or nuisance.

"Wastes discharged from Member operations shall not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable water quality objectives in surface water or a trend of degradation that may threaten applicable Basin Plan beneficial uses, unreasonably affect applicable beneficial uses, or cause or contribute to a condition of pollution or nuisance."

Commented [A57]: Degradation of high quality waters and reduced source water quality in general has significant potential impacts, including public health and welfare risk, drinking water treatment and residual management costs, and the potential for increased water treatment processes and facilities – as well as associated environmental impacts.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.				
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the Project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted 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>Discussion:</p> <p>Addressed below are the impacts to land use and planning from adoption and approval of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments that would: 1) define a regulatory process to evaluate MUN beneficial use designations in Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins; and 2) de-designate MUN from specified water bodies within the SLCC service area.</p> <p>a,b,c) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments do not involve construction of a project. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on dividing an established community; an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation; or conservation plan.</p>				
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the Project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Commented [A58]: Please consider potential future use of LMUN water bodies as source water for potable water use after treatment.

Commented [A59]: See comment above.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>Discussion: Addressed below are the impacts to <u>mineral resources</u> from adoption and approval of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments that would: 1) define a regulatory process to evaluate MUN beneficial use designations in Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins; and 2) de-designate MUN from specified water bodies within the SLCC service area.</p> <p>a,b) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments do not involve construction of a project. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on the availability of mineral resources.</p>				
<p>XII. NOISE. Would the Project result in:</p>				
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	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>Discussion: Addressed below are the impacts to <u>noise</u> from adoption and approval of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments that would: 1) define a regulatory process to evaluate MUN beneficial use designations in Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins; and 2) de-designate MUN from specified water bodies within the SLCC service area.</p> <p>a-f) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments do not involve construction of a project. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on the exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of standards; excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels; a permanent or temporary increase in ambient noise levels; excessive noise levels.</p>				
<p>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the Project:</p>				
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"/>
<p>Discussion: Addressed below are the impacts to <u>population and housing</u> from adoption and approval of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments that would: 1) define a regulatory process to evaluate MUN beneficial use designations in Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins; and 2) de-designate MUN from specified water bodies within the SLCC service area.</p> <p>a) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments do not involve the construction of new housing or businesses, and does not permit additional capacity to POTW dischargers. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on inducement of population growth in an area.</p> <p>b,c) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments do not involve construction of a project. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on the displacement of housing or people.</p>				
<p>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.</p>				
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				

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
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"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Addressed below are the impacts to <u>public services</u> from adoption and approval of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments that would: 1) define a regulatory process to evaluate MUN beneficial use designations in Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins; and 2) de-designate MUN from specified water bodies within the SLCC service area.</p> <p>a) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments do not involve the construction of housing or need to construct or modify any governmental facilities in order to provide continued, suitable public services. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on provision of or need for governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objective for any public services.</p>				
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"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Addressed below are the impacts to <u>recreation</u> from adoption and approval of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments that would: 1) define a regulatory process to evaluate MUN beneficial use designations in Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins; and 2) de-designate MUN from specified water bodies within the SLCC service area.</p> <p>a,b) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments do not permit POTW's additional discharge capacity. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments does not, in any way, 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 Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on recreation.</p>				

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
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"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Addressed below are the impacts to <u>transportation/traffic</u> from adoption and approval of the Basin Plan Amendments that would: 1) define a regulatory process to evaluate MUN beneficial use designations in Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins; and 2) de-designate MUN from specified water bodies within the SLCC service area.</p> <p>a-f) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments do not permit POTWs additional discharge capacity that would induce growth nor would the amendment result in changes to agricultural operations, as related to transportation/traffic generation. Adoption of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would not: a) conflict with an applicable transportation plan, ordinance or policy; b) conflict with a congestion management plan; c) affect air traffic patterns; d) modify roadways, resulting in increased hazards due to design features; e) affect emergency access to any area; or f) conflict with adopted policies. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on transportation/traffic.</p>				

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the Project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Addressed below are the impacts to <u>utilities and service systems</u> from adoption and approval of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments that would: 1) define a regulatory process to evaluate MUN beneficial use designations in Ag dominated water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins; and 2) de-designate MUN from specified water bodies within the SLCC service area.</p> <p>a) With the proposed Basin Plan Amendments, POTW, agricultural, and storm water 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. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would not cause exceedance of waste discharge requirements specified by the Central Valley Water Board. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on exceeding wastewater treatment requirements.</p> <p>b,c,e) As a regulatory action, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments themselves result in no new water or wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage needs, as it does not permit additional POTW discharge capacity or involve construction of new housing. Therefore, the proposed Basin</p>				

Commented [A60]: Please consider if the BPA may result in the need for construction for additional treatment at water treatment plant, as well as the potential for future water treatment facilities to treat water supply from LMUN water bodies that may require advanced treatment. This may be a potentially significant impact. For example, water treatment and residual management facilities may need to be modified to address increased solids, increased loading, etc. Increased water treatment and residual management facilities can result in environmental effects that would need to be mitigated.

Commented [A61]: It is important to prevent degradation of water quality and impacts to downstream MUN. This is supported by the Regional Board's Delta Drinking Water Policy

Commented [A62]: This is not consistent with state and federal antidegradation policies. Moreover, protection of MUN use should not allow degradation up to the MCLs and should prevent trends of degradation for numerical and narrative WQOs. Change in water quality can result in public health and welfare risk and increased water treatment and residual management costs, along with environmental effects if there's the need for additional treatment processes and facilities.

Commented [A63]: Please see earlier comment In this issue section.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on the need for water, wastewater, or storm water facilities.</p> <p>d,f,g) As a regulatory action, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments do not involve construction of new housing. Therefore, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would have <u>no impact</u> on the need for water supplies or solid waste disposal needs.</p>				
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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>Discussion:</p> <p>a) As discussed above for "a" in Biological Resources, with the proposed Basin Plan Amendments, 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. Further, aquatic habitat physical and chemical conditions of importance to biological resources would be similar to existing conditions. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments 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>b) The proposed Basin Plan Amendments would cause less than significant cumulatively considerable impacts. Future discharges to the water bodies no longer designated with the MUN beneficial use as a result of the proposed Basin Plan Amendments would be required to comply</p>				

Commented [A64]: This evaluation is insufficiently robust to support this important BPA that has potential for significant impacts to the water supplies of over 25 million Californians. Please consider providing a water quality evaluation to ensure that there's been consideration of cumulative effects as well as consideration of any water quality problems that necessitated consideration of this BPA.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>with State water quality objectives and federal water quality criteria for protection of all applicable designated beneficial uses. Dischargers 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 renewal process, for any future expanded discharge capacity. Through the Central Valley Water Board's Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, agricultural discharges would continue to be regulated to improve water quality and meet the water quality objectives/criteria for protection of beneficial uses. Similarly, through the Central Valley Water Board's Storm Water Program, storm water discharges would continue to be regulated to address constituents of concern through development of storm water management plans and implementation of BMPs. Thus, the proposed Basin Plan Amendments themselves would cause less than significant cumulatively considerable impacts in the receiving waters or downstream waters of the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins.</p> <p>c) No longer having MUN as a designated beneficial use of applicable Ag dominated surface water bodies and closed controlled recirculating systems in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake basins would not cause substantial adverse effects on humans directly or indirectly. Prior to removing/modifying the MUN beneficial use designations, investigations would be conducted to confirm the water body type and whether the MUN use is an existing or attainable use in each water body under consideration. 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 Amendments relative to the cumulative condition and protection of downstream beneficial uses, including downstream MUN uses not affected by the proposed Basin Plan Amendments, is provided in Section 7.1.4 of the Staff Report.</p>				

Commented [A65]: Please clarify how downstream MUN use and source water quality will be protected.

Commented [A66]: Please address other types of dischargers, and if there are new discharges.

Commented [A67]: Please clarify how the ILRPs will continue to protect downstream MUN.

Commented [A68]: Need to include LMUN in this discussion.

Commented [A69]: Add LMUN into discussion, including the special considerations associated with LMUN including hydrology and background water quality.

Commented [A70]: Please add that review for consideration of LMUN re-designation will also include evaluation of considerations including hydrology and background water quality levels.

Commented [A71]: Please include prevention of reduction of water quality.

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).

Commented [A72]: We are concerned whether there was sufficient problem identification and water quality evaluation to support this determination. Mitigation should be considered or further explanation is needed on how downstream source water quality will be protected.

DRAFT