

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
SAN DIEGO REGION**

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

**FOR BASIN PLAN AMENDMENT CHANGING THE WATER QUALITY
OBJECTIVE FOR NITRATE FOR GROUNDWATER**

**DEVELOPED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT**

**PURSUANT TO PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE
SECTIONS 21000 THROUGH 21177
AND
CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS TITLE 14
SECTIONS 15000 THROUGH 15387**

Table of Contents

A. Project Title 3

B. Applicant 3

C. Applicant’s Contact Person..... 3

D. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting 3

E. California Environmental Quality Act Requirements 4

F. Exemption From Requirement to Prepare Standard CEQA Documents 5

G. Project Description/Description of Proposed Activity 5

H. Analysis of Reasonably Foreseeable Method of Compliance..... 6

I. Environmental Impacts (California Environmental Quality Act Checklist)..... 9

 Section 1. Aesthetics..... 10

 Section 2. Agricultural and Forestry Resources 10

 Section 3. Air Quality..... 12

 Section 4. Biological Resources..... 14

 Section 5. Cultural Resources..... 17

 Section 6. Geology and Soils 18

 Section 7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions..... 20

 Section 8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials 21

 Section 9. Hydrology and Water Quality..... 23

 Section 10. Land Use and Planning 27

 Section 11. Mineral Resources 28

 Section 12. Noise 29

 Section 13. Population and Housing 31

 Section 14. Public Services..... 33

 Section 15. Recreation..... 34

 Section 16. Transportation / Traffic 35

 Section 17. Utilities and Service Systems 37

 Section 18. Mandatory Findings of Significance..... 39

J. Determination 41

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD, SAN DIEGO REGION
2375 NORTHSIDE DRIVE, SUITE 100, SAN DIEGO, CA 92108**

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

A. PROJECT TITLE:

Basin Plan Amendment Changing the Nitrate Water Quality Objective for Groundwater

B. APPLICANT:

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region

C. APPLICANT'S CONTACT PERSON:

Fisayo Osibodu
California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region
Groundwater Protection Branch
2375 Northside Drive, Suite 100, San Diego, CA 92108-2700
619-521-8036
Olufisayo.Osibodu@waterboards.ca.gov

D. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:

The San Diego Region forms the southwest corner of California and occupies approximately 3,900 square miles. The western boundary of the Region consists of the Pacific Ocean coastline. The northern boundary of the Region is formed by the hydrologic divide starting near Laguna Beach and extending inland through El Toro and easterly along the ridge of the Elsinore Mountains into the Cleveland National Forest. The eastern boundary of the Region is formed by the Laguna Mountains and other lesser known mountains located in the Cleveland National Forest. The southern boundary of the Region is formed by the United States-Mexico international border.

The San Diego Region encompasses most of San Diego County, parts of southwestern Riverside County, and southwestern Orange County. The Region is divided into a coastal plain area, a central mountain-valley area, and an eastern mountain-valley area. It consists of eleven hydrologic units that ultimately drain to the Pacific Ocean. The climate in the Region is generally mild with annual temperatures averaging around 65°F near the coastal areas. Average annual rainfall ranges from 9 to 11 inches along the coast to more than 30 inches in the eastern mountains. There are two distinct seasons in the Region. Summer dry weather occurs from late April to mid-October. During this period almost no rain falls. The winter season (mid-October through early April) consists of generally dry weather interspersed by occasional rain storms. Eighty-five to ninety percent of the annual rainfall occurs during the winter season.

The land use of the San Diego Region is highly variable. The western coastline areas are highly developed with urban and residential land uses, and the inland areas primarily consist of open space. The predominant land uses in the Region are open space or recreational land use, followed by low-density residential and agriculture/livestock land uses. Other major land uses are commercial/institutional, high-density residential, industrial/transportation, military, transitional, and water.

E. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT REQUIREMENTS

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (San Diego Water Board) must comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) when amending the *Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (9)* (Basin Plan) as proposed in this project. The proposed Basin Plan Amendment (BPA) makes the following revisions to the Basin Plan:

1. Revises Chapter 3 to change the groundwater quality objective for nitrate to the drinking water Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) of 45 milligrams per liter as nitrate (mg/L as NO₃) in 44 hydrologic areas in the Region. With this change, all hydrologic areas in the Region will have the drinking water MCL as their nitrate water quality objective for groundwater except the Warner Valley Hydrologic Area. Warner Valley's freshwater replenishment beneficial use designation for groundwater precludes changing the nitrate objective.
2. Revises provisions of Chapter 4 (implementation chapter) regarding regulation of OWTS and incorporates the OWTS Policy into the Basin Plan.
3. Revises Chapter 5 to include descriptions of the State Board Policies for OWTS (2012) and Recycled Water (2009, as amended in 2013).

This Environmental Analysis and Checklist only assesses environmental impacts from the proposed action to raise the groundwater quality objective for nitrate to 45 mg/L as NO₃. Analysis of environmental impacts from incorporating the OWTS Policy into the Basin Plan is not necessary because the State Water Board has prepared a Substitute Environmental Document (SED) which assesses environmental impacts from statewide implementation of the OWTS Policy. The State Water Board's SED was prepared in accordance with the Water Board's certified regulatory program, California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 23, Sections 3777 to 3781. The State Water Board approved the Policy and the SED on June 19, 2012. The proposed amendment removes existing Basin Plan provisions regulating OWTS and incorporates the Policy. No substantive changes or modifications to the previously approved OWTS Policy are proposed in the Basin Plan Amendment. No substantial changes with respect to circumstances under which the project will be undertaken have occurred, and no new information triggers the need for supplemental or subsequent CEQA analysis. This amendment is also completely within the scope of the OWTS Policy as analyzed by the State Water Board in the SED.

Under the CEQA, the San Diego Water Board is the Lead Agency for evaluating the environmental impacts of the reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance with the proposed amendments to the Basin Plan. The adoption of a Basin Plan amendment is an activity subject

to CEQA requirements because Basin Plan amendments may constitute rules or regulations requiring the installation of pollution control equipment, establishing a performance standard, or establishing a treatment requirement.¹

F. EXEMPTION FROM REQUIREMENT TO PREPARE STANDARD CEQA DOCUMENTS

The CEQA authorizes the Secretary of the Resources Agency to certify state regulatory programs, designed to meet the goals of the CEQA, as exempt from its requirements to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Negative Declaration, or Initial Study. The State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board) and the San Diego Water Board's Basin Plan amendment process is a certified regulatory program and is therefore exempt from the CEQA's requirements to prepare such documents.²

The State Water Board's CEQA implementation regulations³ describe the environmental documents required for Basin Plan amendment actions. Pursuant to California Code of Regulations Title 23 section 3777, any water quality control plan, state policy for water quality control, and any other components of California's water quality management plan as defined in Code of Federal Regulations, title 40 sections 130.2(k) and 130.6, proposed for board approval or adoption must include or be accompanied by a SED and supported by substantial evidence in the administrative record. The San Diego Water Board prepared this Environmental Checklist SED to assess environmental impacts from the proposed action to raise the groundwater quality objective for nitrate to 45 mg/L as NO₃ and plans to prepare and release a Draft SED at a future date to fulfil this requirement.

G. PROJECT DESCRIPTION/DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTIVITY:

The Basin Plan designates beneficial uses of water bodies, establishes water quality objectives for the protection of these beneficial uses, and outlines a plan of implementation for maintaining and enhancing water quality. The proposed activity is to make the following revisions to the Basin Plan:

1. Revises provisions of Chapter 4 (implementation chapter) regarding regulation of OWTS and incorporates the OWTS Policy into the Basin Plan.
2. Revises Chapter 3 to change the groundwater quality objective for nitrate in 44 hydrologic areas in the Region (except the Warner Valley Hydrologic Area) to the state MCL for drinking water of 45 mg/L as NO₃.
3. Revises Chapter 5 to include descriptions of the State Board Policies for OWTS (2012) and Recycled Water (2009, as amended in 2013).

¹ California Code of Regulations Title 14 section 15187(a)

² California Code of Regulations Title 14 section 15251(g) and Public Resources Code section 21080.5

³ California Code of Regulations Title 23 section 3720 et seq. "Implementation of the Environmental Quality Act of 1970"

The proposed Basin Plan Amendment incorporates the OWTS Policy into the Basin Plan, and amends the criteria to be used by the San Diego Water Board and local agencies to regulate OWTS in the San Diego Region. The OWTS Policy also provides a waiver of the requirement to obtain WDRs for those OWTS that are in compliance with the applicable Tier requirements specified in the OWTS Policy.

The Basin Plan (Chapter 3) establishes groundwater quality objectives for nitrate in regional groundwater resources with designated beneficial uses. Groundwater quality objectives for nitrate throughout the San Diego Region are established at 5, 10, 15, or 45 mg/L as NO₃. Discharges of wastes that contribute nitrate to groundwater may include discharges from OWTS, discharges from wastewater treatment plants, fertilizer application on agricultural operations and on landscape, application of manure at animal operations, landscape irrigation (using potable water, groundwater, or recycled water), etc. The San Diego Water Board typically specifies effluent limits for nitrate or total nitrogen at or below the applicable Basin Plan water quality objective for discharges from wastewater treatment plants or water reclamation facilities using treated effluent for irrigation; or disposing of effluent via percolation basins.

This proposed Basin Plan Amendment changes the groundwater quality objective for nitrate in 44 of the hydrologic areas in the San Diego Region to 45 mg/L as NO₃. The exception to revised groundwater quality objective is the Warner Valley Hydrologic Area where a fresh water replenishment designation has been assigned to groundwater basin which is utilized for supplying water to a lake or stream. To continue support of the existing freshwater replenishment beneficial use, the nitrate groundwater quality objective will remain at 5 mg/L as NO₃.

H. ANALYSIS OF REASONABLY FORESEEABLE METHODS OF COMPLIANCE

This section identifies a range of reasonably foreseeable method(s) of compliance with the Basin Plan amendment. The most reasonably foreseeable methods that a discharger may utilize to ensure their discharge of waste will not cause groundwater to exceed 45 mg/L (the proposed groundwater quality objective for nitrate) include management measures (MMs) and structural and non-structural best management practices (BMPs). Typical MMs/BMPs that may be selected by dischargers are described below.

Implementation of Measures Identified in Salt and Nutrient Management Plans

The State Water Board's Recycled Water Policy (Recycled Water Policy) requires that local stakeholders (which includes water supply and wastewater agencies, municipalities, recycled water purveyors, etc.) develop salt and nutrient management plans (SNMPs) for groundwater basins in California. It is the intent of the Recycled Water Policy salts and nutrients from all sources be managed on a basin-wide or watershed-wide basis in a manner that ensures attainment of water quality objectives and protection of beneficial uses. The State Water Board finds that the appropriate way to address salt and nutrient issues is through the development of regional or subregional SNMPs rather than through imposing requirements solely on individual recycled water projects. The development of the SNMPs is intended to allow for more efficient management of all contributors of salt and nutrients on a watershed basis, and provide

information to the Regional Water Boards that may allow for streamlined permitting of recycled water projects water while protecting water quality.

Individual SNMPs in the San Diego Region have been developed for the San Juan, Temecula, Lower Santa Margarita, San Pasqual, Escondido, Gower, and Santee groundwater basins. These SNMPs include implementation measures to manage salt and nutrient loading in the basins on a sustainable basis. Implementation measures identified in the individual SNMPs to manage nutrient loading include connecting areas served by OWTS to sewage collection systems; repairing leaks in the sewage collection system; increased stormwater infiltration; Indirect Potable Reuse projects; improved nutrient management at agricultural and landscape irrigation operations, etc. A collective SNMP has also been developed, and published in the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan by the San Diego County Water Authority, for the small low priority inland and coastal basins in the San Diego Region.

Non-structural Controls

Non-structural controls typically are aimed at controlling sources of a pollutant and generally do not involve new construction. Non-structural controls are expected to be the first methods to be utilized by facilities such as agricultural operations, composting operations, or animal feeding operations to ensure their operations or waste discharges do not cause concentrations of nitrate groundwater to exceed 45 mg/L as NO₃. No potentially significant impacts on the environment were identified for these controls.

- **Application of Nutrients and Water at Agronomic Rates:** Agricultural and irrigation projects should ensure that fertilizers, soil amendments and water (particularly recycled water) are applied at agronomic rates.⁴
- **Proper Waste Management:** Properly manage where and how wastes are discharged to minimize or eliminate the potential for erosion and pollutants to impact waters of the state. Proper waste management can include, but is not limited to, moving and/or discharging wastes to areas with adequate distance from surface waters and groundwater, ensuring the waste discharge area will minimize or eliminate the discharge of runoff to waters of the state, or ensure waste is not exposed to surface runoff that can transport pollutants (via overland flow or infiltration) to waters of the state. Proper waste management also includes complying with local, state, and federal ordinances and regulations and obtaining any required approvals, permits, certifications, and/or licenses from authorized local agencies.
- **Facility Inspection and Maintenance:** Conduct regular inspections of facilities to identify potential sources of pollutants and locations where discharged wastes may potentially impact waters of the state. Routine inspection and maintenance is an efficient way to prevent potential nuisance situations (e.g., odors, mosquitoes, weeds, etc.), to minimize or

⁴ The irrigation and nitrogen requirements of a plant needed for optimal growth and production. Nitrogen requirements may be as cited in professional publications for California or recommended by the County Agricultural Commissioner, a Certified Agronomist or Certified Soil Scientist. Irrigation rates may be established through the California Irrigation Management Information System (CIMIS), available at <<http://www.cimis.water.ca.gov/cimis/welcome.jsp>>.

eliminate the potential for erosion and pollutants to impact waters of the state, and to reduce the need for repair maintenance.

- **Facility Management Plans:** For facilities that use any products (e.g., fertilizers, compost, etc.) or discharge any wastes on site, adopt a facility management plan to ensure that products and wastes are stored, used, and disposed of in ways that minimize exposure to storm water or surface runoff that can transport pollutants to waters of the state. Products and some wastes (e.g., compost, plant crop residues), when used properly, may also reduce surface runoff and runoff velocity, which can reduce or eliminate erosion and discharges of pollutants to waters of the state.
- **Design, Sizing and Location of Facilities:** Properly design, size, and site facilities to minimize or eliminate the potential for pollutants to impact surface waters or groundwater.
- **Education:** Dischargers should become educated about the, potential sources of pollutants at their facility, potential water quality impacts from sources of pollution at their facility, and measures that may be implemented to ensure discharges of waste from their facilities do not adversely affect water quality. When dischargers become educated about pollutants and their potential impacts, they can implement measures to reduce or eliminate the potential for pollutants to reach and impact waters of the state.

Structural Controls

Structural controls may be utilized to treat, divert, and/or store, discharges of waste. Reasonably foreseeable structural controls that may be implemented by the dischargers are not expected to have significant construction or operation requirements, and are expected to have less than significant and/or short-term impacts on the environment. Structural controls such as advanced OWTS can be used to ensure discharges of domestic wastewater from residences, or commercial or industrial establishments do no adversely impact water quality. Examples of other structural controls that may be utilized include buffer strips and vegetative swales, infiltrative trenches, and diversion and containment systems, and animal exclusion structures, etc.

- **Advanced Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems:** OWTS are used to treat domestic wastewater from residences and commercial and industrial establishments that are not connected to community sewer systems or municipal wastewater treatment plants. When properly designed, sited, operated, and maintained, OWTS treat domestic wastewater to reduce its polluting impacts on the environment and public health. The most common type of OWTS is the septic tank-leach field disposal system.

Advanced or alternative OWTS provide additional removal of pollutants such as nitrogen, pathogens, organics, suspended solids, oil and grease, and nitrogen found in wastewater. Some advanced OWTS have been certified by the National Science Foundation as capable of achieving at least a fifty percent removal rate for nitrogen. Subsurface drip dispersal systems are often used for dispersal of effluent from advanced or alternative OWTS. Subsurface drip dispersal systems are a method of pressure-dosed distribution systems capable of delivering small, precise volumes of wastewater effluent to the soil. Subsurface drip dispersal systems are typically installed at shallow depths which allows for

maximum uptake of nitrogen by vegetation in the disposal area. In some cases, advanced OWTS may be used to ensure discharges of treated wastewater will not cause concentrations of nitrate in groundwater to exceed 45 mg/L as NO₃.

- **Buffer Strips and Vegetated Swales:** Buffer strips and vegetative swales can be constructed and/or maintained around and within a facility to slow surface runoff velocity, filter pollutants, and increase surface runoff infiltration.
- **Infiltration Trenches:** Infiltration trenches can be constructed and designed to capture and naturally filter surface runoff.
- **Diversion and Containment Systems:** Diversion and containment systems can be used to capture surface runoff and/or prevent discharge of pollutants. Surface runoff may be diverted and contained for reuse on site, or it may be diverted to wastewater collection plants for treatment. Diversion and containment systems consist of berms, roofs, liners, or enclosures to drain surface runoff away from discharged wastes, capture runoff from discharged wastes, and/or contain and isolate discharged wastes.
- **Animal Exclusion:** Fencing, hedgerows, and livestock trails and walkways can be used to exclude animals from streams and riparian areas to prevent direct deposition of animal wastes into surface waters and erosion of stream channels. Alternative water supplies and shade may need to be provided if animals are excluded from streams and riparian areas.

I. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

This project may potentially affect the following checked environmental factors. See the checklist on the following pages for more details.

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

Section 1. **AESTHETICS.** Would the project:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

- a) **No impact.** Management measures and reasonably non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would result in the obstruction of the view of a scenic vista, substantially damage scenic resources, degrade the existing visual character or quality of a site or its surroundings, or create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.
- b) **No impact.** See response to section I.1.a above.
- c) **No Impact.** See response to section I.1.a above.
- d) **No Impact.** See response to section I.1.a above.

Section 2. **AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST 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 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 forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the State’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment

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

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural uses?	<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 PRC section 12220(g)] or timberland (as defined by PRC section 4526)?	<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

- a) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.
- b) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale to affect zoning designations established by local land use jurisdictions.
- c) **No Impact.** See response to section I.2.b above.

- d) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use, or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.
- e) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would 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.

Section 3. **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:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) 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 that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls are not expected to be on a scale large enough that would result in obstruction of an applicable air quality plan.
- b) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls are not expected to be on a scale large enough that would result in substantial air emissions or deterioration of air quality, or result in obstruction of an applicable air quality plan.
- c) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls are not expected to be on a scale large enough that would result in substantial air emissions or deterioration of air quality, or result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- d) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls are not expected to be on a scale large enough that would result in substantial air emissions or deterioration of air quality, or result in a considerable net increase of any criteria pollutants.
- e) **Less than Significant Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural controls could result in the creation of objectionable odors if animal wastes and/or compost are stored at a facility. However, proper storage, use and management of such wastes would minimize or eliminate such odors. In rural areas, the number of persons that may be affected and consider it a nuisance would likely be very low. In urban areas, storage and use of such wastes are expected to be on small scales, which would have a less than significant effect on the environment.

Construction and installation of structural controls may result in objectionable odors in the short-term due to exhaust from construction equipment and vehicles, but no more so than during typical construction activities currently performed. Structural controls may be a source of objectionable odors if structural control designs allow for water stagnation or collection of water with sulfur-containing compounds. Storm water runoff is not likely to contain sulfur-containing compounds, but stagnant water could create objectionable odors. However, reasonably foreseeable structural controls are not expected to be on a scale large enough that would result in the significant creation of objectionable odors.

Section 4. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 (DFW) or United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 DFW or USFWS?	<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 federal Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, <i>etc.</i>) 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 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

- a) **Less than Significant Impact.** Implementing management measures and non-structural and/or structural controls will not directly result in 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 DFW or USFWS, because most of these controls would not introduce any physical effects that could impact these characteristics. However, the reduction or elimination of nuisance flows could result in a change in the diversity of species, or number of any species of plants, especially in the dry weather season. No adverse impacts are expected because the elimination of nuisance flows would return the dry weather flows in creek and stream channels to a more natural, pre-development condition. This in turn would facilitate the return of the plant community of creek or stream channel to a more natural, pre-development condition and could impede the propagation of water-loving non-native and invasive plant species. Impeding the propagation of invasive species is not an adverse impact.

The installation of structural controls such as vegetated swales or buffer strips could increase the diversity or number of plant species, which is beneficial to the environment by increasing available habitat. However, during storm events, structural controls could also divert, reduce, and/or eliminate surface water runoff discharge, which may reduce the number and/or diversity of plant species within the streams, by modifying the hydrology of the creeks. However, surface runoff rates were most likely much lower than they are today due to the absence of hardscapes, and structural controls such as vegetated swales and buffer strips would likely restore creek and stream channels closer to more natural, pre-development conditions. Projects that may implement structural controls are not expected to be of the size or scale that could result in a significant change in the diversity of species, or number of any species of plants.

- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** Implementing management measures and non-structural and/or structural controls will not directly result in a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the DFW or USFWS because the measures or controls would not introduce any physical effects that could impact these characteristics. In addition, see response in section I.4.a above
- c) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls are not expected to be on a scale large enough that would result in direct removal or filling of riparian habitat, wetlands, or any sensitive natural communities.
- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** Implementing management measures and non-structural and/or structural controls will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites because the measures or controls would not introduce any physical effects that could impact these characteristics. However, the reduction or elimination of nuisance flows could result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals especially in the dry weather season by eliminating habitat dependent on those flows. If dry weather flows return to a more natural, pre-development condition, animal species that thrived in the creek and stream channels in the absence of nuisance flows are not expected to be adversely impacted by habitat changes if flows are eliminated.

Implementing management measures and non-structural and/or controls would not foreseeably introduce new species. Construction of reasonably foreseeable structural controls likely would not restrict wildlife movement because the sizes of structural controls are generally too small to obstruct a corridor. For terrestrial animals, corridors would be maintained regardless of stream flow as reduced flows would not cause physical barriers for these animals. In the event that any structural controls, such as animal exclusions controls, impede some wildlife migration, fence gaps large enough to allow migrating wildlife to pass through could be included in the design. Projects that may implement structural controls are not expected to be of the size or scale that could result in a significant introduction of new species of animals into an area, or in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals.

- e) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls are not expected to be on a scale large enough that would result in conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.
- f) **No Impact.** See responses to sections I.4.a through I.4.e above.

Section 5. **CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Calif. Code Regs. title 14 section 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 as defined in Calif. Code Regs. title 14 section 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, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls are not expected to be on a scale large enough that would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource, directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or disturb any human remains.
- b) **No Impact.** See response to section I.5.a above.
- c) **No Impact.** See response to section I.5.a above.
- d) **No Impact.** See response to section I.5.a above.

Section 6. **GEOLOGY and SOILS.** Would the project:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 in 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 & Geology Special Publication No. 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 soils, 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 alternate wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls are not expected to be on a scale large enough that would result in exposure of people or structures to geologic hazards because none of these controls would result in earth moving activities. This also response applies to sub-issue sections I.6.a.i through I.6.a.iv.
- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls are not expected to be on a large enough scale that would result in increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off site because none of the non-structural controls would result in increased surface runoff discharge, or in exposing soils to erosion by wind and water.

Depending on the structural controls selected, the proposal may result in minor soil excavation during construction of structural controls. However, construction related erosion impacts will cease with the cessation of construction. Wind or water erosion of soils may occur as a potential short-term impact. Typical established MMs/BMPs should be used during implementation to minimize offsite sediment runoff or deposition. Construction sites are required to retain sediment on site, both under general construction storm water WDRs and through the construction program of the applicable municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4) WDRs; both of which are already designed to minimize or eliminate erosion impacts on receiving waters. Projects that may implement structural controls are not expected to be of the size or scale that could result in significant erosion of soils, either on or off the site.

- c) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls will not be located in unstable geologic units and are not expected to be on a scale large to potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. In addition, see response to section I.6.a above.
- d) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls will not be located in unstable geologic units and are not expected to be on a scale large to potentially result in loss of life or property resulting from soil expansion. In addition, see response to section I.6.a above.
- e) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls will not directly or indirectly result in siting of septic tanks or alternate wastewater disposal systems in soils incapable of adequately supporting their use. The Basin Plan incorporates the State Water Board OWTS Policy. Design and siting criteria for OWTS and dispersal systems are prescribed in the State Water Board OWTS Policy. Environmental impacts from implementation of the OWTS Policy's design and siting criteria are addressed in the SED that was prepared for the OWTS Policy.

Section 7. **GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.** Would the project:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Less than Significant Impact.** Construction and installation of structural controls may result in generation of greenhouse gases in the short-term due to exhaust from construction equipment and vehicles, but no more so than during typical construction activities currently performed. These reasonably foreseeable structural controls, however, are not expected to be on a scale large enough that would result in the significant generation of greenhouse gases.
- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls are not expected to be on a scale large enough that would result in conflict with any applicable plan, policy or agency adopted regulation for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Section 8. **HAZARDS and HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.** Would the project:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) 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 a 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"/>
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 a 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 residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and structural controls are not expected to be of a large enough scale that would create a significant hazard to the environment from transport or disposal of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation).
- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and structural controls (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation) as a result of a reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions. The reasonably foreseeable non-structural and structural BMPs included in this evaluation would not cause the release of hazardous substances in the event of an accident because these types of substances would not be present.
- c) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and structural controls will not involve emission or handling of hazardous substances or waste. In addition the waiver conditions would not induce a project that would involve emission or generation of hazardous wastes. However, individual projects would be required to obtain any necessary permits from the appropriate public or government agencies, and in compliance with CEQA evaluate impacts from hazards and hazardous materials.
- d) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and structural controls will not result in a safety hazard to people working or residing within an area within an airport land use area, two miles of an airport, or a private airstrip. In addition the waiver conditions would not induce a project that would be located within an airport land use plan. However, individual projects would be required to obtain any necessary permits from the appropriate public or government agencies, and in compliance with CEQA evaluate impacts from hazards and hazardous materials.
- e) **No Impact.** See response to section I.8.d above.
- f) **No Impact.** See response to section I.8.d above.

Section 9. **HYDROLOGY and WATER QUALITY.** Would the project:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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"/>
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"/>

9. HYDROLOGY and WATER QUALITY (continued). Would the project:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect 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 proposed project/Basin Plan Amendment, in itself, would not directly result in potential water quality impacts, but non-structural and/or structural controls that promote or utilize infiltration of surface runoff may locally increase the quantity and/or minimally degrade the quality of groundwaters. The increase in localized quantity of surface runoff is unlikely to have any adverse effects since, under pre-development conditions, infiltration rates of storm water runoff to groundwater were most likely much higher than they are today due to the absence of hardscapes. Additionally, non-structural and/or structural controls are not expected to significantly degrade groundwater because the types of discharge would not pose a threat to the quality or beneficial uses of waters of the State, or result in any violations of applicable water quality standards or provisions of the San Diego Region Basin Plan. Implementation of management measures and non-structural and structural controls may lead to improvements of groundwater quality over time.

Individual discharges applying for WDRs will be required to demonstrate compliance with water quality objectives and applicable State and Regional Board policies (such as the State Antidegradation and Recycled Water Policies). WDRs issued by the San Diego Water Board will require application of recycled water at agronomic rates⁵. Application of recycled water at agronomic rates; and considering soil, climate, and plant demand minimizes the movement of nutrients below the plants' root zone. Nitrogen in recycled water applied to crops or landscape will be taken up by the plants, lost to the atmosphere through volatilization of

⁵Refers to the rate of application of recycled water to plants necessary to satisfy the plants' evapotranspiration requirements, considering allowances for supplemental water (e.g., effective precipitation), irrigation distribution uniformity, and leaching requirement, thus minimizing the movement of nutrients below the plants' root zone.

ammonia or denitrification, or stored in the soil matrix. As a result, nitrogen increases are unlikely to impair an existing and/or potential beneficial use of groundwater. To the extent use of recycled water may result in a discharge to a groundwater basin that contains high quality water, individual WDRs will require that the discharge of recycled water demonstrates compliance with the Antidegradation Policy. Further, Salt and Nutrient Management Plans, developed in accordance with the Recycled Water Policy, will require analysis on an ongoing basis to evaluate nitrate inputs to the basin, and available assimilative capacity of the basin.

- b) **No Impact.** Non-structural and/or structural controls that promote or utilize infiltration of surface runoff may have localized effects on groundwaters quantity. Localized effects may include increases rather than decreases in groundwater supply. Therefore, the potential increase in quantity is not expected to have any adverse effects on groundwater recharge or lead to the lowering of groundwater levels.
- c) **Less than Significant Impact.** Structural and non-structural controls would not be of the size or scale to result in significant changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface water runoff.
- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** Management measures and non-structural controls would not result in changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface water runoff because none of these controls would introduce any physical effects that could impact these characteristics.

Depending on the structural controls selected, absorption rates, drainage patterns, and surface water runoff conditions may change. Grading and excavation during construction and installation of structural controls could result in alterations in absorption rates, drainage patterns, and surface water runoff. Several types of structural controls collect and/or inhibit surface water runoff flow, which would likely alter drainage patterns, and also decrease the rate and amount of surface water runoff. For example, structural controls such as buffer strips would change drainage patterns by increasing absorption rates, which would reduce the amount of surface water runoff to creeks. If surface water runoff is diverted to wastewater treatment facilities, thereby reducing the overall flow, the erosion and scour that would normally be caused in the streams by surface water runoff would be reduced. The amount of flow within the stream channel may change; however, the channelized drainage pattern would remain essentially unchanged. Projects that may implement structural controls are not expected to be of the size or scale that could result in significant changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface water runoff.

- e) **Less than Significant Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale to 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.
- f) **Less than Significant Impact.** See response to section I.9.a above.
- g) **No Impact.** The project does not entail construction of new housing. Any housing or construction project would have to prepare a separate project level CEQA analysis for the construction project which must evaluate impacts to hydrology and water quality, and obtain any necessary permits from the appropriate public or government agencies (e.g., building

permits, clearing and grading permits, or permits under the Federal Clean Water Act, etc) to the extent required.

- h) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls that would place housing in a 100-year flood hazard area. In addition see response to section I.9.g above.
- i) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale to result in exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding.
- j) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale to result in exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Section 10. **LAND USE AND PLANNING.** Would the project:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale to result in physical division of a community.
- b) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls to result in conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project.
- c) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale to result in Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Section 11. **MINERAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future 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"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale to result in loss of availability of a known mineral resource.
- b) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale to result in loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

Section 12. **NOISE.** Would the project result in:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 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 in or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing in or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not result in 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. None of these controls would introduce any physical effects that could impact these characteristics.

- b) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls non-structural and/or structural controls would not result in exposure to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels because the controls would not introduce any physical effects that could impact these characteristics.
- c) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity because the controls would not introduce any physical effects that could impact these characteristics.
- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** The construction and installation of structural controls could result in minimal temporary increases in existing noise levels, but any impacts are expected to be short term, localized impacts that would exist only in close proximity to the construction area. The type and duration of noise impacts due to installation of any structural controls are not expected to be significant.
- e) **Less than Significant Impact.** See response to section I.12.d above.
- f) **Less than Significant Impact.** See response to section I.12.d above.

Section 13. **POPULATION AND HOUSING.** Would the project:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., 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.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area.

The proposed action to change the nitrate groundwater quality objective to 45 mg/L as NO₃ is not expected to increase development pressures in areas where soil conditions may be particularly well suited for installation of OWTS (e.g., high-quality agricultural lands). Similarly, local jurisdictions may annex land (e.g., rural agricultural and open space lands) to increase developable areas, changing population growth within local communities. Such actions in themselves would be considered discretionary actions subject to environmental review under CEQA. Such proposals would also be subject to review by neighboring jurisdictions and possibly subject to approval by an applicable Local Agency Formation Commission.

Potential suitability of soils and other requirements in the Basin Plan or OWTS Policy for installation of OWTS would not drive decisions by local governing bodies to pursue annexation of lands at the fringe of developed areas. Rather, local governing bodies would be required to weigh far-reaching variables related to growth and development. Key variables include regional economic trends, market demand for residential and nonresidential uses, land availability and cost, the availability and quality of transportation facilities and public

services, proximity to employment centers, the supply and cost of housing, and regulatory policies or conditions.

Land use planning functions are carried out by local jurisdictions through State of California planning laws. Of those laws that provide the basis for local jurisdictions to govern development within communities, the general plan (Government Code Section 65300 et seq.) and state zoning law (Government Code Section 65800 et seq.) are of primary use to cities and counties working to direct the type, location, and intensity of growth in an area or region. The proposed Basin Plan Amendment would not affect the authority or purpose of state planning law, nor would it affect the land use planning processes of local governing bodies that are undertaken in accordance with state planning law. The proposed Basin Plan Amendment would not enable development to occur in places other than where it is allowed by applicable local agencies. For these reasons, the impact of this issue is considered less than significant.

- b) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would displace substantial numbers of people or housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- c) **No Impact.** See response to section I.13.b above.

Section 14. **PUBLIC SERVICES.** Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service rations, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would result in a need for new or altered fire protection services, police protection services, schools, parks, or other public facilities.
- b) **No Impact.** See response to section I.14.a above.
- c) **No Impact.** See response to section I.14.a above.
- d) **No Impact.** See response to section I.14.a above.
- e) **No Impact.** See response to section I.14.a above.

Section 15. **RECREATION.** Would the project:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would result in an increase in use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities; nor would the controls be of the size or scale to cause substantial physical deterioration of recreational facilities because need for new or altered fire protection services, police protection services, schools, parks, or other public facilities.
- b) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would include or require construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

Section 16. **TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC.** Would the project:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all 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 supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would result in exceeding capacity of the existing circulation system.
- b) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would result in conflict with an applicable congestion management plan.
- c) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would result in a change to air traffic patterns, or alterations to air traffic.
- d) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would result in substantial increase in hazards due to a design feature due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).
- e) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would result in inadequate emergency access.
- f) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would result in a conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Section 17. **UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** Would the project:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 impacts?	<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 that 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would result in a need for wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. However, construction of new water reclamation plants, or expansion of existing water reclamation plants, may result in increased recycled water discharges for irrigation, which may be regulated by adopted waste discharge or reclamation requirements, or waiver of waste discharge requirements. Any wastewater or recycled water projects requiring the issuance of waste discharge or reclamation requirements would require project level CEQA review, at which time potential adverse impacts and appropriate mitigation measures will be evaluated and implemented.
- c) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.
- d) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would result in a substantial increase in water use, or result in the need for new or substantial alterations to water supplies.
- e) **Less than Significant Impact.** See response to section I.17.b above.
- f) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would result in a construction of new landfills or expansion of existing landfills.
- g) **No Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of the size or scale that would result in violation of federal, state, and local statutes related to solid waste.

Section 18. **MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.** Would the project:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** As discussed above in the Biological Resources section I.4 of this SED, plant and animal species could potentially be affected due to the reduction or elimination of nuisance flows, especially in the dry weather season. However, projects that may implement non-structural and/or structural are not expected to be of the size or scale that could result in significant changes that could have an adverse effect on native plant and animal species. In addition, individual projects would also have to prepare a separate project level CEQA analysis that must evaluate impacts to biological resources, and obtain any necessary permits from the appropriate public or government agencies prior to implementation.

- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** Cumulative impacts, defined in section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines, refer to two or more individual effects, that when considered together, are considerable or that increase other environmental impacts. Cumulative impact assessment must consider not only the potential impacts associated with implementing projects to comply with Basin Plan amendment, but also the impacts from other Basin Plan amendment, municipal, and private projects, which have occurred in the past, are presently occurring, and may occur in the future, during the period of implementation.

Cumulative impacts associated with complying with this Basin Plan amendment and other water quality control programs are expected to be less than significant because effective non-structural controls, that are not expected to have any adverse impacts, will most likely be an initial strategy for ensuring discharges do not cause the concentration of nitrogen in groundwater to exceed 45 mg/L as NO₃.

The dischargers may opt to use structural controls to minimize or eliminate erosion and the transport of pollutants to the waters of the state, which would increase the likelihood of potential impacts to the environment that are cumulatively considerable. Present and future specific projects and other construction activities may result in short-term cumulative impacts. The construction of structural controls, along with other construction and maintenance projects, could have short-term cumulative effects. However, these effects are not cumulatively considerable in the long-term because the effects will cease with the completion of construction.

- c) **Less than Significant Impact.** Management measures and reasonably foreseeable and properly implemented non-structural and/or structural controls would not be of a size or scale that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

J. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.

Prepared By:

Draft

Fisayo Osibodu, Water Resources Control Engineer
 California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region
 Groundwater Protection Branch

Date:

Attachment- Hydrologic Areas/Subareas for Which Change to the Nitrate Water Quality Objective for Groundwater is Proposed

Hydrologic Area/Subarea (HA or HSA)	Basin Unit Number	Current Nitrate Water Quality Objective (mg/L as NO ₃)
San Joaquin Hills HSA	901.11	10
Prima Deshecha HSA	901.31	10
Segunda Deshecha HSA	901.32	10
Ysidora HA ^a	902.10	10 ^c
Deluz HA ^m	902.20	10
Deluz Creek HSA ^m	902.21	10
Gavilan HSA	902.22	10
Murieta HA	902.30	10 ^c
Auld HA	902.40	10
Pechanga HA	902.50	10
Pauba HSA ^o	902.51	10
Wolf HA ^p	902.52	10
Wilson HA	902.60	10
Caverocks HA	902.70	10
Agunaga HA	902.80	10
Oakgrove HA	902.90	10
Lower San Luis Rey HA	903.10	10
Moosa HSA	903.10	10
Valley Center HSA	903.14	10
Pala HSA	903.21	15 ^c
Pauma HSA	903.22	10 ^c
La Jolla Amago HSA	903.23	5
Vista HSA ^a	904.22	10 ^b
Agua Hedionda HA ^a	904.30	10
San Marcos HA ^{a,e}	904.50	10
Escondido Creek HSA	904.60	10
Escondido HSA	904.62	10
Hodges HA	905.10	10 ^b
San Pasqual HA	905.30	10 ^b
Santa Maria Valley HA	905.40	10
Santa Ysabel HA	905.50	5
Miramar Reservoir HA	906.10	10
Poway HA	906.20	10
Miramar HA ^{a,g}	906.40	10
Coches HSA	907.14	5 ^b
El Monte HSA	907.15	5 ^b
San Vicente HA	907.20	5
Conejos Creek HSA	907.31	5
Boulder Creek HA	907.40	5

Hydrologic Area/Subarea (HA or HSA)	Basin Unit Number	Current Nitrate Water Quality Objective (mg/L as NO ₃)
National City HA	908.30	10
Middle Sweetwater HA	909.20	10
Upper Sweetwater HA	909.30	10
Otay Valley HA	910.20	10 ^b
Dulzura HA	910.30	10

Endnotes

- a. The water quality objectives do not apply westerly of the easterly boundary of Interstate Highway 5. The objectives for the remainder of the Hydrologic Area (Subarea) are as shown.
- b. Detailed salt balance studies are recommended for this area to determine limiting mineral concentration levels for discharge. On the basis on existing data, the tabulated objectives would probably be maintained in most areas. Upon completion of the salt balance studies, significant water quality objective revisions may be necessary. In the interim period of time, projects of ground water recharge with water quality inferior to the tabulated numerical values may be permitted following individual review and approval by the Regional Board if such projects do not degrade existing ground water quality to the aquifers affected by the recharge.
- c. The recommended plan would allow for measurable degradation of ground water in this basin to permit continued agricultural land use. Point sources, however, would be controlled to achieve effluent quality corresponding to the tabulated numerical values. In future years demineralization may be used to treat ground water to the desired quality prior to use.
- e. The water quality objectives do not apply to hydrologic subareas 4.51 and 4.52 between Highway 78 and El Camino Real and to all lands which drain to Moonlight Creek, Cottonwood Creek and Encinitas Creek. The objectives for the remainder of the Hydrologic Area are as shown.
- g. The water quality objectives do not apply west of Interstate Highway 15. The objectives for the remainder of the Hydrologic Area are as shown.
- m. These objectives apply to the alluvial ground water beneath the Santa Margarita River from the confluence of Murrieta and Temecula Creeks through the Gavilan and DeLuz HSAs to a depth of 100 feet and a lateral distance equal to the area of the floodplain covered by a 10 year flood event. These objectives do not apply to ground water in any of the basins beneath DeLuz, Sandia, and Rainbow Creeks and other unnamed creeks, which are tributaries of the Santa Margarita River.
- o. These objectives apply to ground waters within 250 feet of the surface for the most downstream 4,200 acres of the Pauba HSA (2.51) which drain directly to the most downstream 2.7 mile segment of Temecula Creek. Excluded from this area are all lands upgradient from a point 0.5 miles east of the intersection of Butterfield Stage Road and Highway 79.