Appendix B. CEQA Checklist

Associated with the Draft <u>Final</u> Staff Report Including the Draft <u>Final</u> Substitute Environmental Documentation for the <u>Draft Final Proposed</u> Desalination Amendment

THE PROJECT

1. **PROJECT TITLE**: Amendment of the Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California for Desalination Facility Intakes, Brine Discharges, and Other Non-substantive Changes.

2. LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS:

State Water Resources Control Board – Division of Water Quality 1001 | Street Sacramento California 95814

3. CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER:

Contacts:

Ms. Claire Waggoner, Environmental Scientist

Email Claire.Waggoner@Waterboards.ca.gov

Phone (916) 341-5582

4. PROJECT LOCATION:

Ocean Waters of California

5. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT:

The proposed Desalination Amendment, if adopted, would establish a uniform approach for protecting beneficial uses of ocean waters from degradation due to seawater intake and discharge of brine wastes from desalination facilities. The proposed Desalination Amendment will protect and maintain the highest reasonable water quality possible for the use and enjoyment of the people of the state. The proposed Desalination Amendment contains four primary components intended to control potential adverse impacts to marine life associated with desalination facility intakes and brine discharges as described below.

- Implementation procedures for evaluating the best site, design, technology, and mitigation measures to minimize the intake and mortality of marine life at new or expanded desalination facilities.
- A receiving water limit for salinity applicable to all desalination facilities to ensure that brine discharges to marine waters do not cause adverse effects to marine species and communities.
- Alternative implementation procedures for discharges of waste brine to minimize marine life mortality at desalination discharges.
- Provisions protecting sensitive habitats, sensitive species, MPAs, and SWQPAs from degradation of water quality associated with desalination facility intakes and discharges.

The Desalination Amendment, if adopted, would apply intake-related provisions to all new and expanded desalination facilities that intake state ocean waters. Discharge

requirements would apply to all desalination facilities. The proposed Desalination Amendment would be implemented through NPDES permits or WDRs issued by the applicable regional water board in consultation with the State Water Board. The goals of the proposed Desalination Amendment are to accomplish the following:

- Provide a consistent statewide approach for minimizing intake and mortality of marine life, protecting water quality, and related beneficial uses of ocean waters. Meeting this goal will address the need for a uniform statewide approach for controlling adverse effects of desalination facilities that are not currently addressed in the Ocean Plan or the Statewide Water Quality Control Policy on the Use of Coastal and Estuarine Waters for Power Plant Cooling (OTC Policy).
- 2. Support environmentally responsible desalination in California and to use ocean water as a reliable alternative to traditional water supplies.
- 3. Promote interagency collaboration for siting, design, and permitting of desalination facilities and to help define the roles of the Water Boards in regulating such facilities.

EVALUATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS IN THE CHECKLIST

- The board must complete an environmental checklist prior to the adoption of plans or policies for the Basin/208 Planning program as certified by the Secretary for Natural Resources. The checklist becomes a part of the SED.
- 2. For each environmental category in the checklist, the board must determine whether the project will cause any adverse impact. If there are potential impacts that are not included in the sample checklist, those impacts should be added to the checklist.
- If the board determines that a particular adverse impact may occur as a result of the project, then the checklist boxes must indicate whether the impact is "Potentially Significant," "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," or "Less than Significant."
 - a. "Potentially Significant Impact" applies if there is substantial evidence that an impact may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries on the checklist, the SED must include an examination of feasible alternatives and mitigation measures for each such impact, similar to the requirements for preparing an EIR.
 - b. "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies if the board or another agency incorporates mitigation measures into the SED that will reduce an impact that is "Potentially Significant" to a "Less than Significant Impact." If the board does not require the specific mitigation measures itself, then the board must be certain that the other agency will in fact incorporate those measures.
 - c. "Less than Significant" applies if the impact will not be significant, and mitigation is therefore not required.
 - d. If there will be no impact, check the box under "No Impact."
- 4. The board must provide a brief explanation for each "Potentially Significant," "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," "Less than Significant," or "No Impact" determination in the checklist. The explanation may be included in the written report described in section 3777, subdivision (a)(1) or in the checklist itself. The explanation of

each issue should identify: (a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and (b) the specific mitigation measure(s) identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant. The board may determine the significance of the impact by considering factual evidence, agency standards, or thresholds. If the "No Impact" box is checked, the board should briefly provide the basis for that answer. If there are types of impacts that are not listed in the checklist, those impacts should be added to the checklist.

- The board must include mandatory findings of significance if required by CEQA Guidelines section 15065.
- 6. The board should provide references used to identify potential impacts, including a list of information sources and individuals contacted.

EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST

The checklist identifies those impacts representing the Desalination Amendment project and alternatives and does not provide a detailed evaluation of a particular desalination facility (presented in Section 12.1). A detailed discussion of the impacts and associated findings of the Desalination Amendment project and alternatives are presented in section 8 and 12.4 of this document.

CEQA Checklist

Amendment of the Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California for Desalination Facility Intakes and Brine Discharges, and Other Non-substantive Changes

Issue I. AESTHETICS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a sceni	. 🗖			
vista?	c 🔨	Ш	Ш	Ш
b) Substantially damage scenic resources,			,	
including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a sta	_{ite} \square		\checkmark	
scenic highway?				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual	N			
character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	V	Ц	ш	Ш
d) Create a new source of substantial light or				
glare which would adversely affect day or	Ш	Ш	\checkmark	
nighttime views in the area?				

The proposed Desalination Amendment could impact aesthetics; however some of these impacts can be reduced to less than significant with mitigation as described in section 12.1.1 and 12.4.1. In addition, construction and operation of desalination facilities in general would require actions outside of the jurisdiction of the water boards to implement and enforce. Some of those impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. 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 Boards. Would the project: a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or $| \checkmark |$ Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland),

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	e			
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				\checkmark
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				V
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				
The proposed Desalination Amendment wo	ould not resul	t in the loss or c	conversion of	

The proposed Desalination Amendment would not result in the loss or conversion of farmland or conflict with existing timber or forest zoning because the scope of the water board action relates to intake of seawater and discharge of brine at ocean locations only. As determined on a case-by-case basis, desalination facilities in general may adversely impact agriculture or forest resources, however, these impacts would not be caused directly or indirectly by the State Water Board's proposed Desalination Amendment. In the interest of full disclosure, the construction and operation of desalination facilities could cause impacts to agriculture or forest resources that are unrelated to the State Water Board's project. Those impacts that may occur from approval of a particular desalination facility are described in section 12.1.2.

III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	$\overline{\checkmark}$		
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			\checkmark
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		V	

iiiipact	Incorporated	Impact	No Impact
	·	-	
			$\overline{\checkmark}$
			V
	Impact	•	Significant Mitigation Significant Impact Incorporated Impact

The proposed Desalination Amendment could potentially result in significant and unavoidable impacts if additional power is needed to implement these alternatives and fossil fuel power plants are relied upon to provide the power. These potential impacts are described in section 12.4.2. In the interest of full disclosure, the potential site specific impacts to air quality that may occur from approval of a particular desalination facility and unrelated to the proposed Desalination Amendment are discussed in section 12.1.3 of the Staff Report.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:			
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	V		
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by section 404 of the CWA (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	V		
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?	V		
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			\checkmark
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?			V

		Less Than Significant		
Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

The proposed Desalination Amendment could potentially result in significant impacts to biological resources as described in section 12.4.3, however, some of these impacts can be mitigated to result in less than significant impacts. In the interest of full disclosure, the potential site specific impacts to biological resources that may occur from approval of a particular desalination facility are discussed in section 12.1.4 of the Staff Report.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:		
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?		V
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?		V
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		$\overline{\checkmark}$
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		V

The proposed Desalination Amendment would not affect historical, archeological, or paleontological, geologic features or human remains because the scope of the water board action relates to intake of seawater and discharge of brine that would occur or be located in the coastal ocean environment. As determined on a case-by-case basis, desalination facilities may adversely impact cultural resources. However, these impacts would not be caused directly or indirectly by the State Water Board's proposed Desalination Amendment. In the interest of full disclosure, these potential site specific impacts to cultural resources that may occur from approval of a particular desalination facility are discussed in section 12.1.5 of the Staff Report.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:		
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:		V
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.		V
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		V

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				V
iv) Landslides?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss topsoil?	of			$\overline{\checkmark}$
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?	- 🗆			
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				V
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste wat disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	ter \square			V
The proposed Desalination Amendment would not result in increased risk associated with geologic hazards such as ground shaking, ground failure or increased potential for soil erosion because the scope of the water board action relates only to the intake of seawater and discharge of brine that would occur or be located in the coastal ocean environment. As determined on a case-by-case basis, the siting, design and location of individual desalination facilities will need to consider these factors to address and minimize the potential risks associated with soils and geologic conditions onsite. However, these impacts would not be caused directly or indirectly by the State Water Board's proposed Desalination Amendment. In the interest of full disclosure, these potential site specific impacts associated with soils and geology that may occur from approval of a particular desalination facility are discussed in section 12.1.6 of the Staff Report.				
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISS	IONS			
Would the project:				
a) Generate Greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significan impact on the environment?				
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				\checkmark

The proposed Desalination Amendment could potentially result in significant greenhouse gas emissions as a result of construction activities described in 12.4.4. .

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?	, Ц			\checkmark
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?	ne 🔲			V
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile o an existing or proposed school?				V
d) Be located on a site which is included on a lift of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	t a 🔲			V
e) For a project located within an airport land uplan 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?	se			V
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?				V
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfer with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	ere			\checkmark
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				

The proposed Desalination Amendment would not directly or indirectly create a significant hazard to the public, result in increased emissions or cause a project to be located on a hazardous waste site because the scope of the water board action relates only to the intake of seawater and discharge of brine that would occur or be located in the coastal ocean environment. As determined on a case-by-case basis, the siting, design and location of individual desalination facilities will need to consider these factors to address and minimize the potential hazards and the use of, or exposure to hazardous materials by onsite workers and the public working and residing in the area. However, these impacts would not be caused directly or indirectly by the State Water Board's proposed Desalination Amendment. In the interest of full disclosure, potential hazards that may occur from approval of a particular desalination facility are discussed in section 12.1.8 of the Staff Report.

Issue IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER	Potentially Significant Impact QUALITY	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies of interfere substantially with groundwater recharges such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level while would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	ge Ch			
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage patter 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?	а			
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 if flooding on- or off-site?				V
e) Create or contribute runoff water which woulexceed the capacity of existing or planned stor water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				V
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water qualit		$\overline{\checkmark}$		
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazar area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or othe flood hazard delineation map?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	d \square			V
i) Expose people or structures to a significant r of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	isk 🔲			$\overline{\checkmark}$
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				$\overline{\checkmark}$

The State Water Boards adoption of the proposed Desalination Amendment could result in less than significant impacts to Hydrology and Water Quality as described in section 12.4.5. In the interest of full disclosure, impacts associated with the construction and operation of desalination facilities in general are described in section 12.1.9

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				V
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdicti over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal progra or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	e nm, of			V
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				V
The proposed Desalination Amendment would not physically divide a community, or conflict with land use plans policies or habitat conservation plans because the scope of the State Water Board action relates only to the intake of seawater and discharge of brine that would occur or be located in the coastal ocean environment. As determined on a case-by-case basis, the siting, design and location of desalination facilities in general could impact land use and planning; however, these impacts would not be caused directly or indirectly by the State Water Board's proposed Desalination Amendment. The siting, location and design of each individual facility would need to consider local land use plans policies and conservation plans. In the interest of full disclosure, potential site specific impacts to land use and planning that may occur from approval of a particular desalination facility are discussed in Section 12.1.10 of the Staff Report.				State would case land by the sign of ervation
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
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?	n 🗖			\checkmark

The proposed Desalination Amendment would not affect mineral resources. The scope of the water board action relates only to the intake of seawater and discharge of brine that would occur during the operation of a desalination facility in the coastal ocean environment where few mineral resources have been identified as described in section 12.1.11 of the Staff Report.

XII. NOISE

Issue Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of nois levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				V
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborn noise levels?	е			V
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				\checkmark
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase ambient noise levels in the project vicinity abov levels existing without the project?				\checkmark
e) For a project located within an airport land us 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?				V
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residir or working in the project area to excessive nois levels?				V

The proposed Desalination Amendment would not cause directly or indirectly exposure to harmful noise, excessive groundborne vibration or increase ambient noise above existing levels because the scope of the water board action relates only to the intake of seawater and discharge of brine in the coastal ocean environment. As determined on a case-by-case basis, the construction and operation of individual desalination facilities will need to address and minimize noise impacts; however, these impacts would not be caused directly or indirectly by the State Water Board's proposed Desalination Amendment because the infrastructure required by the proposed Desalination Amendment would be, from the perspective of noise generation, equivalent to infrastructure that would be needed for any desalination facility. In the interest of full disclosure, potential noise related impacts that may occur from approval of a particular desalination facility are discussed in section 12.1.12 of the Staff Report.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	\checkmark
	V

Issue replacement housing elsewhere?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				V
The proposed Desalination Amendment we growth, displace housing or residents becard only to the intake of seawater and dischard determined on a case-by-case basis, the season desalination facilities will need to address primpacts would not be caused directly or incompact to the interest of the interes	ause the scop ge of brine in siting, constru population, gr directly by the of full disclosu acility and the d in section 12	the of the water be the coastal ocean ction and operationand housing State Water Board, potential imperpotential for great the control of the	oard action rean environme tion of individuing; however, pard's proposocts that mayowth associate	elates nt. As ual these ed y occur
times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: i) Fire protection?				$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$
ii) Police protection?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
iii) Schools?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
iv) Parks?				V

The proposed Desalination Amendment would not cause directly or indirectly impacts to fire services, police protection or the need for new schools parks or other public facilities because the scope of the Water Board's action relates only to the intake of seawater and discharge of brine in the coastal ocean environment. As determined on a case-by-case basis, the siting, construction and operation of individual desalination facilities will need to take into account any potential impacts to public services. However, these impacts would not be caused directly or indirectly by the State Water Board's proposed Desalination Amendment. In the interest of full disclosure, potential impacts that may occur from approval

v) Fire protection?

vi) Other public facilities?

 $\overline{\mathbf{V}}$

Issue of a particular desalination facility and the p water supply are discussed in section 12.1.			Less Than Significant Impact ed with more	No Impact reliable
XV. RECREATION				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				V
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?				V
The proposed Desalination Amendment wo of regional parks or recreational facilities or facilities because the scope of the Water Boand discharge of brine in the coastal ocean basis, the siting, construction and operation consider any potential impacts to recreation directly or indirectly by the State Water Boa interest of full disclosure, potential impacts desalination facility and the potential impact of the Staff Report. XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFF Would the project:	require constraints action environment of individual it, however, the rd's propose that may occurs to recreation	struction or expanse relates only to a relates only to a t. As determined desalination from the properties of the proper	ansion of new the intake of ed on a case- cilities will ne ould not be c Amendment. al of a particu	y seawater by-case eed to aused In the
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to intersections, streets highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	or g ng			
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?				V
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safe risks?	ty 🗖			\checkmark
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a designature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous	gn 🔲			$\overline{\checkmark}$

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				V
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				V

The proposed Desalination Amendment would not cause directly or indirectly conflicts with applicable traffic plans, policies, or ordinances nor would it conflict with traffic management plans, or increase traffic and associated hazards because the scope of the Water Board's action relates only to the intake of seawater and discharge of brine in the coastal ocean environment. As determined on a case-by-case basis, the siting, construction and operation of individual desalination facilities will need to take into account for potential impacts to traffic; however, these impacts would not be caused directly or indirectly by the State Water Board's proposed Desalination Amendment. In the interest of full disclosure, potential impacts that may occur from approval of a particular desalination facility during construction and operation are discussed in section 12.1.16 of the Staff Report.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:		
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?		\checkmark
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?		\checkmark
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?		
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?		V
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?		\checkmark
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?		\checkmark

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				V

The proposed Desalination Amendment would not cause directly or indirectly impacts to wastewater treatment, require construction of new wastewater facilities, expansion of existing facilities or construction or expansion of stormwater retention systems or landfills because the scope of the Water Board's action relates only to the intake of seawater and discharge of brine in the coastal ocean environment. As determined on a case-by-case basis, the siting, construction and operation of individual desalination facilities will need to take into account the potential impacts to utilities and service systems; however, these impacts would not be caused directly or indirectly by the State Water Board's proposed Desalination Amendment. In the interest of full disclosure, potential impacts that may occur from approval of a particular desalination facility are discussed in section 12.1.17 of the Staff Report.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?		V
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		V

As discussed in section 12.4.3, the proposed Desalination Amendment has the potential to impact biological resources through the construction of facilities that are similar to, but potentially of greater complexity than would occur in absence of the amendment. Given desalination facilities could potentially be located throughout the state, it is reasonably foreseeable that facilities will be situated within designated habitat for special status species. While suitable mitigation measures are available to reduce these impacts to less than

significant, many of these mitigation measures are not within the jurisdiction of the water boards to enforce. Therefore, there is a potential for significant impact to wildlife including special status species and their habitat.

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION

The proposed Desalination Amendment COULD NOT have a significant effect on the
environment, and, therefore, no alternatives or mitigation measures are proposed.

☑ The proposed Desalination Amendment MAY have a significant or potentially significant effect on the environment, and therefore alternatives and mitigation measures have been evaluated.