SECTION VII. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

A. 1. 2.	Background: Name of Proponent: State Water Resources Address and Phone Number of Proponent: I P.O. Box 944213, Sacramento, CA 94244-213	Division of	Water Quality		
3. 4. 5.	Date Checklist Submitted: September 12, Agency Requiring Checklist: Resources Ag Name of Proposal, if Applicable: Police	1997 Nove gency SWRC	ember 15, 1999 <mark>B</mark>	January 31 oxics Stand	-
в.	for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, Environmental Impacts:	, and Estuar	ies of Califor	nia_	
2.	(Explanations are included on attached s	sheets).	Potentially Significant		
		Potentially Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impac
I.	LAND USE AND PLANNING.	_	_	_	_
	Would the proposal:				
	a. Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?	on []	[]	[]	[x]
	b. Conflict with applicable environmenta plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?		[]	[]	[X]
	c. Be incompatible with existing land us in the vicinity?	se []	[]	[]	[X]
	d. Affect agriculture resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	e. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community(including a low-income or minority community)?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
II.	POPULATION AND HOUSING.				
	Would the proposal:				
	a. Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	. []	[]	[]	[x]
	b. Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	c. Displace existing housing, especiall affordable housing?	y []	[]	[]	[x]
III.	GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS.				
	Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:				
	a. Fault rupture?	[]	[]	[]	[x]

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b.	Seismic ground shaking?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
c.	Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
d.	Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
e.	Landslides or mudflows?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
f.	Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading or fill?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
g.	Subsidence of the land?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
h.	Expansive soils?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
i.	Unique geologic or physical features?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
IV.	WATER. Would the proposal result in: Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
b.	Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
c.	Discharge into surface water or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)?	[x]	[]	[]	[]
d.	Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
e.	Changes in currents or the course or direction of surface water movements?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
f.	Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of ground water recharge capabil		[]	[]	[x]
g.	Altered direction or rate of flow of ground water?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
h.	Impacts to ground water quality?	[X]	[]	[]	[]
i.	Substantial reduction in the amount of ground water otherwise available for public water supplies?	[]	[]	[]	[x]

V.	AIR	QUALITY.	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		 ld the proposal:				
	a.	Violate any air quality standard contribute to an existing or projair quality violation?		[]	[]	[x]
	b.	Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	c.	Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	d.	Create objectionable odors?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
VI.	TRA	NSPORTATION/CIRCULATION.				
	Wou.	ld the proposal result in:				
	a.	Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	b.	Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	c.	Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	d.	Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	e.	Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	f.	Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	g.	Conflicts with adopted policies supporting transportation (e.g., turnouts, bicyclists racks)?	[] bus	[]	[]	[x]
VII.	BI	OLOGICAL RESOURCES.				
	Wou!	ld the proposal result in impacts t	to:			
	a.	Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (include but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?	[X] Hing	[]	[]	[]
	b.	Locally designated species?	[X]	[]	[]	[]

			Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	C.	Locally designated natural communities (e.g. oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?	[x]	[]	[]	[]
	d.	Wetland habitat (e.g. marsh, ripa and vernal pool)?	rian [X]	[]	[]	[]
	e.	Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?	[X]	[]	[]	[]
VIII	. <u>EN</u>	ERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES.				
	Wou	ald the proposal:				
	a.	Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	b.	Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient mann	[] ner?	[]	[]	[x]
	C.	Result in the loss of availability a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the St		[]	[]	[x]
IX.	HA	ZARDS.				
	Wor	ald the proposal involve:				
	a.	A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not linto: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	b.	Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	c.	The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	d.	Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazard	[X] ds?	[]	[]	[]
	e.	Increased fire hazard in areas wit flammable brush, grass, or trees?	ch []	[]	[]	[x]
Х.	NO	ISE.				
	Woi	ald the proposal result in:				
	a.	Increases in existing noise levels	3? []	[]	[]	[x]
	b.	Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	[]	[]	[]	[x]

VT	DIT	DI TO GEDVITOEG	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI.		BLIC SERVICES.				
	up or	uld the proposal have an effect on or result in a need for new altered government services in y of the following areas:				
	a.	Fire protection?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	b.	Police protection?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	c.	Schools?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	d.	Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	e.	Other governmental services?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
XII.	UT	ILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.				
	ne or	ald the proposal result in a ed for new systems or supplies substantial alterations to the llowing utilities:				
	a.	Power or natural gas?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	b.	Communications systems?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	С.	Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	d.	Sewer or septic tanks?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	e.	Storm water drainage?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	f.	Solid waste disposal?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	g.	Local or regional water supplies?	. []	[]	[]	[x]
XIII	. <u>AE</u>	STHETICS.				
	Wo	uld the proposal:				
	a.	Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	b.	Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	c.	Create light or glare?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
XIV.	<u>CU</u>	LTURAL RESOURCES.				
	Wo	uld the proposal:				
	a.	Disturb paleontological resources	3? []	[]	[]	[x]

	b.	Disturb archaeological resources?	Potentially Significant Impact []	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact []	No Impact [X]
	c.	Affect historical resources?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	d.	Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	e.	Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
XV.		EATION d the proposal:				
	a.	Increase the demand for neighborhor or regional parks or other recreational facilities?	ood []	[]	[]	[x]
	b.	Affect existing recreational opportunities?	[X]	[]	[]	[]
XVI.	MAN a.	DATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. 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-sust levels, threaten to eliminate a planimal community. Reduce the number restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate examples of the major per of California history or prehistory.	taining lant or oer or minate eriods	[]	[]	[]
	b.	Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage or long-term, environgoals?		[]	[]	[x]
	c.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other cumprojects, and the effects of probability.)	s that ect st rrent	[]	[]	[]
	d.	Does the project have environments effects which will cause substants adverse effects on human beings,		[]	[]	[]

~	DETERMINATION
- •	DETEKMINATION

Based	on	the	eval	uat	ion	in	FED	Section	VI,	I :	find	that	only	one	of	the	propos	ed	Policy
issues	CO	uld	have	а	sign	ifi	cant	adverse	ef:	fec	t on	the	enviro	onmer	nt:	con	mplianc	e i	schedules.

Date
Stan Martinson, Chief
Division of Water Quality
State Water Resources Control Board

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

- I.a.,b.,c.,e. Land use and planning (e.g., general plans and zoning) delineate those areas that will be developed, and the type and density of development to be allowed. There is nothing in the proposed Policy that requires property to be used in any way or prohibits property uses.
- I.d. The regulation of nonpoint source toxic substances such as pesticides could impact farming operations. However, the SWRCB is not changing its three-tiered approach to nonpoint source regulation, outlined in its Nonpoint Source Management Plan (NPS Plan). The SWRCB and RWQCBs will continue to work with nonpoint source dischargers under this approach the existing NPS Plan. See Section VI, Chapter 1, Part 5.2, Nonpoint Source Discharges.
- II.a.,b.,c.;XV.a. See FED Section VI, Chapter 3, Growth-Inducing Impacts.
- III.a.,b.,d. These geologic actions are caused by plate tectonics, not by water pollution. However, people could potentially be exposed to such impacts during the construction or operation of new facilities to treat water pollution. If the proposed Policy caused dischargers to build and operate additional new facilities or substantially alter existing facilities, these potential impacts would be considered for the proposed action. However, the Policy is not expected to require dischargers to take such compliance actions. See FED Section VI, Chapter 2, Reasonable Means of Compliance.
- III.c. Liquefaction occurs in the subsurface when the mechanical behavior of a granular material is transformed from a solid state to a liquid state due to loss of grain-to-grain contact during earthquake shaking. It occurs most often in areas underlain by saturated, unconsolidated sediments. Seismic ground failure is not caused or affected by water pollution.
- III.e.,f.,g.,i.;V.a.,b.,d.;VI.a.,b.,c.,d.,e.,f.,g.;VIII.a.,b.,IX.a.,b.,e.;X.a.,b.;XI.a.,b.,c.,d.,e.;XII.a.,b.,f.;XIII.a.,b.,c.;XIV.a.,b.,c.,d.,e. Landslides, erosion, impacts to transportation systems, energy impacts, odors, impacts to public services and utilities, impacts to wildlife areas, and impacts to aesthetics or cultural resources could occur during the construction or operation of new facilities to treat water pollution. If the proposed Policy caused dischargers to build and operate additional new facilities or substantially alter existing facilities, these potential impacts would be considered for the proposed action. However, the proposed Policy is not expected to require dischargers to take such additional compliance actions. See FED Section VI, Chapter 2, Reasonable Means of Compliance.
- III.h. Expansion of soils is influenced by amount of moisture change and the type of soil (the amount of clay in the soil, and the type of minerals in the clay). Shrink-swell is measured by the volume change in the soil. Water pollutants do not significantly affect the shrink-swell capacity of soils.
- IV.a.,b.,d.,e.,f.,g.,i. Levels of toxic substances do not affect absorption rates, drainage patterns, surface runoff, flooding, quantity of surface or ground water, surface water currents, or ground water flow or supply. These impacts could occur if the proposed Policy would cause dischargers to take additional actions to modify their operations for compliance purposes. However, the proposed Policy is not expected to require dischargers to take such additional compliance actions. See FED Section VI, Chapter 2, Reasonable Means of Compliance.
- IV.c.;VII.a.,b.,c.,d.,e.;IX.d.;XV.b;XVI.a.,d. Only one issue (compliance schedules) in the proposed Policy has the potential to cause significant adverse effects to water quality; biological resources, including plants and animals and threatened or endangered species; and human health. See FED Section VI, Potentially Significant Effects, for an analysis of effects of each of the proposed Policy issues on surface water quality and the

achievement of human health and aquatic life criteria/objectives. The issue of compliance schedules is discussed in Chapter 1, Issue 2.1, Section VI of the FED. IV.h. As stated above, only one issue (compliance schedules) has the potential to cause significant adverse effects to surface water quality. This could result in some effects to ground water quality in "losing streams" where surface water percolates to ground water.

- V.c. The proposed Policy does not involve or affect temperature, humidity, precipitation, winds, cloudiness, or other atmospheric conditions.
- VIII.c. The proposed Policy does not involve or affect the mining of mineral resources.
- XII.c.,d.,e.,g. Effects on water utility and service systems could potentially occur if the proposed Policy would cause dischargers to have to take additional compliance actions that involved construction or substantial alterations to treatment facilities. However, the Policy is not expected to require dischargers to take such compliance actions. See FED Section VI, Chapter 2, Reasonable Means of Compliance. Also see Section VI analysis regarding storm water.
- XVI.b.,c. See FED Section VI, Chapter 4, regarding cumulative and long-term impacts.