

Attachment K – Environmental Checklist

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Requirements

The attached checklist and the “Staff Report for Chollas Creek Diazinon TMDL” fulfill the requirements specified under section 3777 [California Code of Regulations, Title 23].

1. Project title: Chollas Creek Water Quality Attainment Strategy for Diazinon Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)
2. Lead agency name and address: San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, 9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100, San Diego, CA 92123-4340
3. Contact person and phone number: Linda Pardy (858) 627-3932
4. Project location: Chollas Creek Watershed, San Diego County, California
5. Project sponsor's name and address: State of California, State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Quality, 1001 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95812-0100
6. General plan designation: Not Applicable
7. Zoning: Not Applicable
8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.) The purpose of the Chollas Creek Water Quality Attainment Strategy for Diazinon Total Maximum Daily Load is to specify the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) implementation plan provisions. The goal of the TMDL is to reduce diazinon concentrations in Chollas Creek to meet water quality objectives for toxicity and pesticides. The implementation plan requires dischargers to comply with the numeric targets for diazinon in Chollas Creek, comply with the waste discharge prohibitions and water quality objectives in the Basin Plan and develop and implement an approved ‘Diazinon Toxicity Control Plan’. The ‘Diazinon Toxicity Control Plan’ will include three components: (1) education and outreach program (2) storm water policies, procedures and /or ordinances, and (3) a long-term monitoring plan for diazinon.
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings: Urban
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.) Not Applicable

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

I. Aesthetics – Would the proposal:	Impact	Maybe	No Impact
a. Adversely affect a scenic vista?			X
b. Adversely affect a scenic highway, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings?			X
c. Substantially change the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?		X	
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare?			X
Comment: Implementation of education and outreach best management practices (BMPs) is not expected to degrade the visual character of the watershed. However, the education and outreach may lead to an increased awareness of watershed resources and improvement in the way residents care for the watershed.			
II. Agricultural Resources – Would the proposal:	Impact	Maybe	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 and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			X
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?			X
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?			X
III. Air Quality – Would the proposal:	Impact	Maybe	No Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or protected air quality violation?			X
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X

Comment: It is not expected at this time that any projects arising from TMDL implementation will involve air emissions, thereby affecting air quality. Reducing the discharge of diazinon into the watershed can only improve air quality.

IV. Biological Resources – Would the proposal result in:

	Impact	Maybe	No Impact
a. Adversely affect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X
b. Adversely affect any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X	
c. Adversely affect federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X
e. Conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X
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?			X

Comment: Installation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) or stream restoration activities, which may result from this proposal, may temporarily disturb aquatic or terrestrial habitat. However, the overall purpose of the TMDL is to provide for long term improvements in water quality and aquatic habitat. To the extent that stream restoration may increase amounts of riparian vegetation in the watershed, nonpoint source controls are expected to be beneficial to wildlife.

V. Cultural Resources – Would the proposal:

	Impact	Maybe	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?			X
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?			X

V. Cultural Resources – Would the proposal:	Impact	Maybe	No Impact
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X
Comment: Significant excavation or disturbance of cultural resources is not expected to result from this proposal or from projects that result from this proposal.			

VI. Geology and Soils – Would the proposal:	Impact	Maybe	No Impact
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving fault rupture, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure (e.g. liquefaction), landslides?			X
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X
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?			X
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 19-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?			X
Comment: The implementation of BMPs to reduce wet and dry season overland surface runoff will likely reduce the potential for soil erosion.			

VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Would the proposal:	Impact	Maybe	No Impact
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?		X	
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?		X	
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?		X	
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result,			X

VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Would the proposal:

	Impact	Maybe	No Impact
would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X
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?			X
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildlands fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X
This project may result in the collection of unused diazinon pesticides at pesticide collection facilities. The pesticide collection facilities are required to have proper procedures in place to ensure the collection does not create a significant hazard to the public, school children or the environment. Pick-up of unneeded/unused diazinon pesticides from residents reduces the likelihood of illicit disposal and contamination of public schools, facilities and waterways.			

VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality – Would the proposal:

	Impact	Maybe	No Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		X	
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)?			X
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?		X	
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?			X
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed			

VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality – Would the proposal:

Impact Maybe No Impact

the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

X

f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

X

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?

X

h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area, structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?

X

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?

X

j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

X

Comment: This project may result in the collection of unused diazinon pesticides at pesticide collection facilities. The pesticide collection facilities are required to have proper procedures in place to ensure the collection does not create a significant hazard to the public, school children or the environment. Pick-up of unneeded/unused diazinon pesticides from residents reduces the likelihood of illicit disposal and contamination of public schools, facilities and waterways.

Also, there may be a potential for the installation of structural or vegetative best management practices (BMPs) that may be located within a 100-year flood hazard area and may impede or redirect flood flows. The precise location and significance of these impacts cannot be determined at this time. Specific structural BMPs should be evaluated for site-specific environmental impacts prior to installation.

IX. Land Use and Planning – Would the proposal:

Impact Maybe No Impact

a. Physically divide an established community?

X

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?

X

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

X

Comment: The purpose of the TMDL is to provide for long-term improvements in water quality and aquatic habitat. To the extent that they increase amounts of wetland treatment in the watershed, nonpoint source controls will be beneficial to wildlife.

X. Mineral Resources – Would the proposal:

Impact Maybe No Impact

a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?

X

X. Mineral Resources – Would the proposal:	Impact	Maybe	No Impact
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?			X
XI. Noise – Would the proposal:	Impact	Maybe	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?			X
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		X	
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X
e. For projects located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X
Comment: Although this proposal does not identify the use of specific BMPs, the construction/installation of structural BMPs may cause a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the activity. The monitoring investigation may involve activities, such as the installation or testing of monitoring stations, may also cause a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the activity. Neither of which is expected to be substantial in nature.			
XII. Population and Housing – Would the proposal:	Impact	Maybe	No Impact
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, thorough extension of roads or other infrastructure)?		X	
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?		X	
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?		X	
XIII. Public Services –	Impact	Maybe	No Impact
Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a			

XIII. Public Services –

	Impact	Maybe	No Impact
need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:			
a. Fire protection?			X
b. Police protection?			X
c. Schools?			X
d. Parks or other recreational facilities?		X	
e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?		X	
f. Other governmental services?		X	

Comment: Although this proposal does not identify the use of specific BMPs, education and outreach BMPs will be used to educate school children, public facilities employees, and watershed residents about the hazards of diazinon pesticides to people and the environment. The education and outreach is expected to improve the understanding of people about diazinon pesticides and consequently reduce diazinon entry into the environment.

Although this proposal does not specify the use of specific BMP's, BMP's may also include wetland treatment of nonpoint source runoff. If wetland treatment ponds are installed and maintained on public lands or easements, local government services could be impacted.

Additionally, local government will need to expend resources to perform the investigation of surface water issues, and to develop and implement a diazinon toxicity control plan. Since the purpose of the TMDL is to provide for attainment of water quality standards and restoration of beneficial uses, such expenditure of resources could be considered to be for the public good.

XIV. Recreation – Would the proposal:

	Impact	Maybe	No Impact
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?		X	
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?			X

Comment: The purpose of the TMDL is to provide for attainment of water quality standards and restoration of beneficial uses. The improvement of the water quality will likely benefit the warm water habitat and wildlife habitat beneficial uses. The improvement of the water quality will likely benefit the aesthetic enjoyment of people who visit areas near the creek along parks and other recreational facilities. Also, the improvement of water quality in Chollas Creek, a tributary to San Diego Bay, will improve water quality and the beneficial uses of San Diego Bay. Furthermore, the improvement of water quality into the Bay will likely benefit the aesthetic enjoyment of people who visit the Bay.

XV. Transportation/Traffic – Would the proposal:

	Impact	Maybe	No Impact
a. Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in			X

XV. Transportation/Traffic – Would the proposal:	Impact	Maybe	No Impact
either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X
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?			X
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?			X
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X
XVI. Utilities and Service Systems – Would the proposal:	Impact	Maybe	No Impact
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?		X	
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?		X	
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X
Comment: This proposal identifies the need for further investigation to determine if diazinon is continuing to contribute to the impairment of Chollas Creek. The result of this investigation may implicate that further action is necessary to ultimately achieve water quality objectives in the			

surface waters. If wetland treatment facilities are needed, these facilities would require separate environmental review.

XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance – Would the proposal:

	Impact	Maybe	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?			X
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)?			X
c. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X	
Comment: The purpose of the TMDL is to provide for attainment of water quality standards and restoration of beneficial uses. Residents of the watershed will be impacted in that they will have to take actions to reduce their diazinon contributions to Chollas Creek. However, they will benefit as a result of improved quality of the environment that will come from restoration of beneficial uses.			

10.4 Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation, I find that the proposed Basin Plan amendment could not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

-and/or-

I find that the proposed Basin Plan amendment could have a significant adverse effect on the environment. However, there are feasible alternatives and /or feasible mitigation measures that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impact. These alternatives are discussed in the attached written staff report.

-and/or-

I find the proposed Basin Plan amendment may have a significant effect on the environment. There are no feasible alternatives and/or feasible mitigation measures available which would

substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts. See the written staff report for a discussion of this determination.

John H. Robertus
Executive Officer

Date