

DRAFT NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project Name: Waste Discharge Requirements for the Garcia Residence for an
Alternative Onsite Wastewater Treatment System, San Diego County

Tentative Order Number: R9-2009-0005

**This Document is Considered Draft Until it is Adopted by the California Regional
Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region**

This Draft Negative Declaration is comprised of this form along with the Environmental Initial Study that includes the Environmental Checklist Form.

1. *California Environmental Quality Act Negative Declaration Findings:*

This Negative Declaration reflects the decision-making body's independent judgment and analysis, and; that the decision-making body has reviewed and considered the information contained in this Negative Declaration and the comments received during the public review period, and; on the basis of the whole record before the decision-making body (including this Negative Declaration) that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment.

2. *Required Mitigation Measures:*

None.

3. *Critical Project Design Elements That Must Become Conditions of Approval:*

None.

ADOPTION STATEMENT: This Negative Declaration was adopted and above California Environmental Quality Act findings made by the:

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region

On March 11, 2009

John H. Robertus
Executive Officer
Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. Project title:
Waste Discharge Requirements for the Garcia Residence for an Alternative Onsite Wastewater Treatment System
2. Lead agency name and address:
California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region
9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92123
3. Contact person and phone number:
Ms. Cathryn Henning
(858)-636-3161
4. Project location:
The property is located off Fortuna Ranch Road in the unincorporated community of Olivenhain in the County of San Diego. APN 264-101-54.
5. Project sponsor's name and address:
California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region
9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92123
6. General plan designation:
Estate Residential 1 DU/2,4 Acres
7. Zoning:
Rural Residential
8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

The proposed project is issuance of Waste Discharge Requirements for the Garcia Residence's installation of an alternative onsite wastewater treatment system (OWTS). The proposed alternative OWTS is licensed by *Orengo Systems Inc.* as the AdvanTex ® Treatment System with discharge to a subsurface drip system with material manufactured and distributed by Geoflow™. The OWTS will receive approximately 300 gallons of waste a day and dispose of this waste to 1500 square feet via a subsurface trickle irrigation system.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

Rural residential land use surrounds the property. Five out of the eight adjacent properties are developed.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).

Grading required for the construction of house, pool, etc. is exempt from CEQA requirements pursuant to section 15304, minor alterations to land. No other public agency approval is required for the installation of the alternative OWTS.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.


Signature

1/29/2009
Date

John H. Robertus
Name

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such

- effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
- c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
 - 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
 - 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
 - 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Issues:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact.** The new OWTS is associated with the construction of a single family residence on a property not located in a scenic area. The OWTS is located primarily underground, and any above-grade elements have a relatively low profile. Installation of the OWTS is not expected to damage scenic resources or degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.
- b) **No Impact.** See response to item (a) above.
- c) **No Impact.** See response to item (a) above.
- d) **No Impact.** Permanent sources of external lighting are not a feature of OWTS and operation of OWTS would not generate new sources of light or glare. Thus, the proposed project would not create a new source of light and glare.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:</p>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact.** The new OWTS would not result conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use because the use of the land is designated for rural residential use.
- b) **No Impact.** The new OWTS would not result in a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract because the use of the land as a dairy requires the land be designated for rural residential use.
- c) **No Impact.** The new OWTS would not result in other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use because the use of the land as a dairy requires the land be designated for rural residential use.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	----------------------

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:

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
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"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not alter the number of OWTS that would be constructed in the future, nor would it meaningfully, if at all, alter the amount of land converted to OWTS-related uses. Furthermore, the operation of OWTS systems does not generate criteria pollutants specific to air quality. The proposed project would not affect applicable air quality plans.
- b) **No Impact.** See response to item (a) above.
- c) **No Impact.** See response to item (a) above.
- d) **No Impact.** See response to item (a) above.
- e) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The proposed regulations include provisions that would require new and existing OWTS systems to operate in such a way that no objectionable odors would be emitted (Section 22910[c]). The proposed regulations also contain specific requirements for maintenance and repair of faulty systems. Odors could occur for brief periods in areas immediately surrounding OWTS when septic tank clean-out operations are in progress; however since the project will be located un a rural-residential land use area, such odors will not affect a substantial number of people.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES --				
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
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

- a) **No Impact.** The proposed project will result in the removal of natural vegetation; however the system will be placed underground and the surface will be re-vegetated upon completion of the installation of the OWTS. Therefore, the project would not significantly alter the amount of undeveloped terrestrial habitat converted to OWTS-related uses. The project will occur on land that has been previously impacted within the past five years by fuel management / weed control activities. There are no known or identified unique, rare, threatened, or endangered species residing on the site.
- b) **No Impact.** The OWTS will be installed with at least five feet of separation between the system and seasonal high groundwater. Percolation of treated effluent into the deeper soil profiles is a critical component of the treatment process for pathogen reduction. For these reasons, the OWTS would not be constructed in areas where they could affect wetlands through direct removal or filling. Groundwater could affect surface waters, including wetlands, but due to the significant distance between the project site and any surface waters, there is not expected to be an adverse effect on surface waters.
- c) **No Impact.** See response to item (b) above.

- d) **No Impact.** The project would not significantly alter the amount of undeveloped terrestrial habitat converted to OWTS-related uses, therefore, the project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native terrestrial species. Discharge from the OWTS is expected to be of quality so as to not adversely affect groundwater, and thus not adversely affect surface waters and interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish.
- e) **No Impact.** The proposed regulations address construction, operation, and maintenance of individual treatment systems for residences and small commercial sites, and do not address local plans, policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Therefore, potential conflicts with such plans, policies or ordinances are not expected.
- f) **No Impact.** See response to item (e) above.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES --				
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	----------------------

including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact.** The OWTS will be constructed on land that is not a known historical, archaeological, or paleontological resource. There are no known human remains to be found within the boundary of the project location.
- b) **No Impact.** See response to item (a) above.
- c) **No Impact.** See response to item (a) above.
- d) **No Impact.** See response to item (a) above.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	----------------------

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, 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"/>

DISCUSSION

a.i) **No Impact.** The proposed project is not located on such a fault zone based on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area.

a.ii) **No Impact.** See response to item (a.i) above.

a.iii) **No Impact.** See response to item (a.i) above.

a.iv) **No Impact.** The project is located on a 2.5 acre lot which begins at the crest of a large hilltop and falls to the southeast with a vegetated slope on the order of 14%. The construction of the OWTS is not expected to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides.

b) **No Impact.** The OWTS will be constructed on stable, nonexpansive soil that is not acceptable for the use of a conventional septic system; therefore, the proposed OWTS is designed for the site specific conditions, including the poor percolation rates. The disposal system is designed to accept the volume of the effluent and provide for adequate agronomic uptake. The use of subsurface drip to discharge effluent from the proposed OWTS has proven successful elsewhere in the nation and is not expected to cause substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil, or cause soil to become unstable.

c) **No Impact.** See response to item (b) above.

d) **No Impact.** See response to item (b) above.

e) **No Impact.** See response to item (b) above.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	----------------------

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 Section 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 hazard for people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

change the risk of accidental release. However, the potential impact is considered less than significant because the risk of accidental release is anticipated to be low, the quantity of waste material that may be discharged would typically be limited to the small quantity carried by individual pumping trucks, and it is anticipated that accidental spills would be cleaned up in accordance with normal emergency response service (i.e., fire, police) directives and septage hauler licensing requirements.

- c) **No Impact.** The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, on a site listed on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5, or within an airport land use plan.
- d) **No Impact.** See response to item (c) above.
- e) **No Impact.** See response to item (c) above.
- f) **No Impact.** See response to item (c) above.
- g) **No Impact.** Installation, operation, and maintenance of OWTS would take place primarily on residential and small commercial sites and would not interfere with emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.
- h) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not alter the number of OWTS that would be constructed in the future, nor would it meaningfully, if at all, alter the amount of land converted to OWTS-related uses. Therefore, potentially significant impacts involving an increase in the risk of wildland fires are not expected.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	----------------------

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER
 QUALITY -- Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The OWTS disposal system is designed to discharge the treated waste for agronomic uptake by plants and for infiltration of the residual into soil. In addition, the OWTS is designed to reduce biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), total suspended solids (TSS), and total nitrogen. Monitoring of the treated waste is required through waste discharge requirements to ensure compliance with discharge specifications. The treated waste is not expected to infiltrate to groundwater or resurface and drain into surface waters. Resurfacing effluent will be prohibited by waste discharge requirements, violation of this prohibition is cause for a major repair to be commenced within 30 days of reported violation.

- b) **No Impact.** Installation and maintenance of the OWTS system does not use groundwater supplies, thus, the proposed project would not lower the levels of the groundwater table.
- c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not alter the number of OWTS that would be constructed in the future, nor would it meaningfully, if at all, alter the amount of land converted to OWTS-related uses. Therefore, this potential impact is considered less than significant.
- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** See response to item (c) above.
- e) **Less than Significant Impact.** See response to item (c) above.
- f) **Less than Significant Impact.** See response to item (a) above.
- g) **No Impact.** The project is located at the top of a crest, not located within a 100-year flood hazard area, and therefore is not expected to expose people or structures to a risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding or inundation.
- h) **No Impact.** See response to (g) above.
- i) **No Impact.** See response to (g) above.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------

IX. 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact.** The proposed project will not physically divide an established community, conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project, or conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.
- b) **No Impact.** See response to item (a) above.
- c) **No Impact.** See response to item (a) above.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact.** The proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources.
- b) **No Impact.** See response to item (a) above.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
the project?				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

DISCUSSION

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not alter the number of OWTS that would be constructed in the future, nor would it meaningfully, if at all, alter the amount of land converted to OWTS-related uses. Operation and maintenance of OWTS are not typically noise-producing activities. Supplemental treatment systems may have mechanical components that produce a low level of noise during operation. Because OWTS are generally installed near residences and small commercial enterprises, the sound levels produced by the system are designed to be minimal. Maintenance activities, such as pumping of septic tanks, take place occasionally and could involve higher levels of noise disturbance, but these activities are temporary and occur only periodically (in the case of pumping, once every few years). For these reasons, the proposed project is considered to have a less-than-significant noise impact.

- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** See the response to item (a) above.
- c) **Less than Significant Impact.** See the response to item (a) above.
- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** See the response to item (a) above.
- e) **No Impact.** The proposed project is not located within an airport use plan or located within two miles of a public airport.
- f) **No Impact.** See the response to item (e) above.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Less than Significant Impact.** OWTS are generally installed in rural areas as part of a building permit for a new home or small business. As such, these systems tend to be installed in areas where population growth is taking place. However, the proposed regulations are not expected to allow installation of OWTS in areas and on properties where they are not allowed under current regulations. As a result, implementation of the proposed project would not have the general effect of inducing population growth in areas. Structures in place or requirements in the WDR would not result in substantial population growth in an area and will not include construction of new homes, businesses, roads, or infrastructure.
- b) **No Impact.** Installation of OWTS typically accompanies housing construction and would not displace housing. Thus, there would be no impact.
- c) **No Impact.** See response to item (b) above.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	----------------------

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>

DISCUSSION

a) **No Impact.** The OWTS will be a privately owned facility operated by an individual homeowner. These systems do not require fire or police protection, educational or recreational services to construct, operate, or maintain them. Other public facilities are not expected to be impacted.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION --				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact.** The proposed project will occur in a rural area as part of a new home construction. The OWTS is designed solely for the purpose of treating wastewater, and are not related to recreational facilities. As such, the proposed project would have no impact on the use of recreational facilities.
- b) **No Impact.** See the response to item (a) above.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC --				
Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Installation of the OWTS will occur in a rural area where traffic loads are relatively light. Construction activities associated with the OWTS installation will likely include use of a backhoe, a dump truck, and possibly one additional piece of construction equipment operating for less than one week. Operation and maintenance activities would include an increase in septic tank inspections and perhaps pumping, but related vehicle trips would occur infrequently and on roads where traffic loads are relatively light. The proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on traffic conditions.
- b) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** As discussed above in the response to item (a), OWTS installation and maintenance could increase traffic on local and rural roadways, but by a minimal amount and on an infrequent basis. This impact is considered less than significant.
- c) **No Impact.** Installation of the OWTS will have no impact on air traffic patterns.
- d) **No Impact.** The OWTS will not be installed directly adjacent to a roadway and will have no impact on traffic hazards.

- e) **No Impact.** Because the proposed project would not increase the number of OWTS installed over time, OWTS-related traffic patterns or emergency access to either the site of the treatment system or surrounding areas will likely not be affected.
- f) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project will occur in a rural area at the end of a cul-de-sac where there will be minimal impacts, for brief periods of time, to parking capacity.
- g) **No Impact.** For the same reasons described in items (a) through (f) above, and since alternative transportation systems are not likely to be established at or around the project site, there will be no impact to alternative transportation systems.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------

XVI. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** See the related discussion in Section VIII, "Hydrology and Water Quality," item (a).
- b) **No Impact.** The proposed project addresses installation, operation, and maintenance of an OWTS system, which operate independently of any water or wastewater treatment facilities. Impacts on treatment facilities are not expected.
- c) **No Impact.** The proposed project addresses installation, operation, and maintenance of an OWTS system, which operate independently of any storm

drainage system that may be present in a community. Impacts on storm water drainage facilities are not expected.

- d) **No Impact.** The proposed project addresses installation, operation, and maintenance of an OWTS system, and would not impact water supply entitlements.
- e) **No Impact.** This potential impact is not expected because the OWTS will operate independently of the centralized wastewater treatment facilities operated by treatment providers. Thus, there would be no impact.
- f) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project could increase the amount of OWTS septage that would be treated at centralized treatment plants or disposed of in septage ponds lined in compliance with Title 27, or through prescribed land application where public contact does not occur. Treatment of septage at centralized treatment plants would generate a solid waste byproduct referred to as biosolids. Biosolids are typically disposed of in landfills; since the OWTS will only be treating a maximum of 750 gallons of waste per day, the existing landfill capacities should be sufficient.
- g) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not change the manner in which solid waste is created, handled, or disposed of. Thus, there is no reason to believe the proposed project would change how solid waste handling and disposal regulations are complied with.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	----------------------

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not alter the number of OWTS that would be constructed in the future, nor would it meaningfully, if at all, alter the amount of land converted to OWTS-related uses. For these reasons, it is not expected that the OWTS would result in the degradation of 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.

- b) **No Impact.** The proposed project will be installed on a 2.5 acre lot in a rural residential land use area, where there is substantial distance between the proposed project and neighboring septic systems. In addition, the proposed project would not alter the number of OWTS that would be constructed in the future, nor would it meaningfully, if at all, alter the amount of land converted to OWTS-related uses. For these reasons, the proposed project is not expected to have a cumulatively considerable impact.

- c) **No Impact.** The proposed project is not expected to adversely affect water quality. The requirements in the WDR prohibit resurfacing of treated waste and are require monitoring in order to avoid substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. For these reasons, the proposed project is not expected to have an adverse affect on human beings.