

## APPENDIX B: ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

### Background

**PROJECT TITLE:** Amendment-s to ~~the Statewide~~ Water Quality Control Plans ~~for the Ocean Waters of California to Control Trash and Part 1 Trash Provisions of the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California to Control Trash~~

**LEAD AGENCY:** State Water Resources Control Board  
Division of Water Quality  
1001 I Street  
Sacramento, California 95814

### CONTACT:

#### Primary Contact:

Dr. Maria de la Paz Carpio-Obeso, Ocean Standards Unit Chief  
Office Phone: (916) 341-5858  
Email: MarielaPaz.Carpio-Obeso@waterboards.ca.gov

#### Secondary Contact:

Johanna Weston, Ocean Standards Unit Environmental Scientist  
Office Phone: (916) 327-8117  
Email: Johanna.Weston@waterboards.ca.gov

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California, and Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT:** The State Water Board is proposing ~~Amendments to Statewide Water Quality Control Plans to Control Trash (Trash Amendments) an Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California to Control Trash and Part 1 Trash Provisions of the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California. The amendment to control trash and Part 1 Trash Provisions are collectively referred to as the "Trash Amendments".~~<sup>25</sup> ~~proposes to adopt the Trash Amendments into both the Ocean Plan and the~~

---

<sup>25</sup> ~~The State Water Board intends to amend the Water Quality Control Plan for Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California to create the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California Plan (ISWEBE Plan). The State Water Board intends that the Part 1 Trash Provisions will be incorporated into the ISWEBE Plan, once it is adopted.~~

~~forthcoming ISWEBE Plan~~. The provisions proposed in the proposed final Trash Amendments include six elements: (1) water quality objective, (2) applicability, (23) prohibition of discharge, (34) implementation provisions, (54) time schedule, ~~(5) a time extension option for State Water Board consideration~~, and (6) monitoring and reporting requirements. The proposed provisions would apply to all surface waters of the state, with the exception of those waters within the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles Water Board with trash or debris TMDLs that are in effect prior to the effective date of the Trash Amendments.

The State Water Board’s project objective for the proposed final Trash Amendments is to address the impacts of trash on surface water bodies across California (with the exception of those waters within the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles Water Board with trash or debris TMDLs that are in effect prior to the effective date of the Trash Amendments) through development of a statewide plan governing trash. The project objective for the proposed final Trash Amendments is to provide statewide consistency for the Water Boards’ regulatory approach to protect aquatic life and public health beneficial uses, and reduce environmental issues associated with trash in state waters, while focusing limited resources on high trash generating areas.

The reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance with the proposed final Trash Amendments are described in Section 5, and the environmental effects are described in Section 6 of the Draft proposed Final Staff Report. The reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance are addressed by type of trash-control method, namely: treatment controls (e.g., catch basin inserts, vortex separation systems, trash nets, and Gross Solids Removal Devices), institutional controls (e.g., enforcement of litter laws, street sweeping, storm drain cleaning, public education, and ordinances), and LID and multi-benefit projects.

## Environmental Impacts

The environmental factors checked below could be potentially affected by this project. See the Section 6 of the Draft proposed Final Staff Report for more details.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):

AESTHETICS. Would the project:

- |    |   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) | Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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"/> |

Although the proposed [final](#) Trash Amendments do not require land alteration, it is expected that some minimal land alteration would be associated with several of the reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance. While compliance may require the installment of full capture systems, it is unlikely that the aesthetics of the natural environment would be adversely affected by improvements to existing infrastructure.

The general aesthetic characteristic of those portions of the state where the proposed [final](#) Trash Amendments would be implemented are densely urbanized. Implementing trash reduction measures should reduce the visual effects of litter generated within the jurisdiction and should reduce the visual effects of the high volumes of trash that collect downstream from the upstream sources. Trash may collect near storm water inlets where capture devices block trash from entering the storm water system. The amount of trash that may accumulate at these locations should not differ from baseline conditions, and the trash accumulating would not be entering the storm water system. Increased street sweeping and other institutional controls could lessen the amount of trash near storm water drop inlets, decreasing the amount of trash that may accumulate. Implementation of the proposed [final](#) Trash Amendments would eventually improve the overall aesthetic appeal of the state by the removal of visible trash, thus resulting in a positive impact.

Since vortex separation system units and catch basin inserts would be installed within already existing storm drain networks, it is also not foreseeable that the installation of a vortex separation system or catch basin insert would substantially damage scenic resources and/or degrade the existing visual character or quality of any particular location and its surroundings. It is not foreseeable that the installation activities associated with these units would result in any substantial adverse effect on the scenic vistas of the location. Catch basin insert are unlikely to create an aesthetically offensive site after installation because they are installed at street level.

Installation of in-line trash nets would not foreseeably obstruct scenic vistas or opens views to the public as their installation will be limited to locations within the storm drain system and not in open channels. To the extent that a particular control at a particular site could obstruct scenic views, such an impact could be avoided by employing non-

structural controls such as increased litter enforcement. End-of-Pipe trash nets are surface devices and could impair the aesthetics of the installation site. This impairment could be alleviated by employing alternative structural devices, such as in-line trash nets, or by employing nonstructural controls, such as increased litter enforcement. Trash nets could also become targets of vandalism. Improved security measures and enforcement of anti-vandalism regulations could decrease instances of vandalism.

Gross Solids Removal Devices are subsurface devices and, as such, would not foreseeably obstruct scenic vistas or open views after installation. The installation of Gross Solids Removal Devices, however, may affect the aesthetics of the installation site. This effect on aesthetics could be lessened by using construction BMPs, such as screening off the construction site. Standard architectural and landscape architectural practices can be implemented to reduce impacts from aesthetically offensive structural impacts. Any effects would be short-term and not be considered to substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

Gross Solids Removal Devices, as well as trash nets, could also become targets of vandalism. Vandalized structures may become an aesthetically offensive site. Vandalism, however, already exists to some degree in most urbanized areas and adding new structures are not likely to have any impact upon current vandalism trends over baseline conditions. Improved security measures and enforcement of anti-vandalism regulations could decrease instances of vandalism.

Neither increased street sweeping, enforcement of litter laws, ordinances, nor public education result in impairment of scenic and open views. Rather, these alternatives would pose a positive aesthetic impact by reducing visible trash.

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

**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 (1997) 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:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code 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"/> |

The proposed final Trash Amendments would not affect agriculture or farmland as they do not alter zoning laws or require conversions to different land uses. Significant trash generation is not expected on agricultural or forestry lands, therefore the use of structural BMPs is not likely in these areas.

Increased street sweeping would be implemented in currently urbanized areas, and it is unlikely that this implementation would cause the removal, disturbance or change in agricultural or forest resources. The implementation would not result in new population or employment growth at the extent that could create a need for new housing development on agricultural or forest land. The implementation also would not require any off-site road improvements or other infrastructure that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use.

Enforcements of litter laws, ordinances, and public education would be implemented in currently urbanized areas. There are no foreseeable impacts on agricultural or forest resources.

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

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

- |  |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Potential impacts to air quality due to implementation of the proposed final Trash Amendments are discussed in Section 6.2 Air Quality of the ~~Draft~~ proposed Final Staff Report.

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

**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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?   | <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, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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?

Potential impacts to biological resources due to implementation of the proposed final Trash Amendments are discussed in Section 6.3 of the ~~Draft~~ proposed Final Staff Report.

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

**CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?
- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in § 15064.5?
- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Potential impacts to cultural resources due to implementation of the proposed final Trash Amendments are discussed in Section 6.4 Cultural Resources of the ~~Draft~~ proposed Final Staff Report.

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

**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:
- 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 42.
- ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

Potential impacts to geological and soil resources due to implementation of the ~~draft~~ **proposed final** Trash Amendments are discussed in Section 6.5 Geology/Soils of the ~~Draft~~ **proposed Final** Staff Report.

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

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

a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potential impacts from greenhouse gas emissions due to implementation of the proposed **final** Trash Amendments are discussed in Section 6.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions of the ~~Draft~~ **proposed Final** Staff Report.

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

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

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or to the environment?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 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?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Potential impacts from hazards or hazardous materials due to implementation of the proposed final Trash Amendments are discussed in Section 6.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials of the Draft proposed Final Staff Report.

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

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

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>
Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>
Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potential impacts to hydrology and water quality due to implementation of the proposed final Trash Amendments are discussed in Section 6.8 Hydrology/Water Quality of the Draft proposed Final Staff Report.

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

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

a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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"/> |

Potential impacts to land use and planning due to implementation of the proposed **final** Trash Amendments are discussed in Section 6.9 Land Use/Planning of the **Draft** proposed Final Staff Report.

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

**MINERAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |

The proposed **final** Trash Amendments will not have a substantial impact on mineral resources. Any mineral resources that may occur within areas chosen for the installation of structural controls will have already been made unavailable by the existence of the current land uses and related infrastructure. Implementation of the proposed **final** Trash Amendments will not further impact any potential mineral resources.

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

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

- |   |                          |                                     |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Potential noise impacts due to implementation of the proposed **final** Trash Amendments are discussed in Section 6.10 Noise and Vibration of the **Draft proposed Final** Staff Report.

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

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

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

The proposed **final** Trash Amendments would not induce population growth, affect housing, or displace individuals. See also Section 7.1 Growth-Inducing Impacts of the **Draft proposed Final** Staff Report for further discussion.

Vortex separation systems (i.e., Continuous Deflective Separation units) are installed below grade and are appropriate for highly urbanized areas where space is limited. The installation of vortex separation systems may require modification of storm water conveyance structures. These devices can be installed in existing storm drain infrastructure, therefore, no additional land is required nor is there a need to displace existing housing. Maintenance of the vortex separation system involves the removal of the solids either by using a vacuum truck, a removable basket or a clam shell excavator depending on the design and size of the unit. Therefore, it is not reasonably foreseeable that the installation and maintenance of vortex separation systems would directly or indirectly induce population growth, displace people or existing housing, or create a

demand for additional housing. To the extent that these devices, if employed, would displace available housing, it is not reasonably foreseeable that the responsible agencies would install such a device. Rather, an agency would foreseeably opt for non-structural control measures, such as enforcing litter ordinances.

The Gross Solids Removal Devices were developed by Caltrans to be retrofitted below grade into existing highway drainage systems or installed in future highway drainage systems. These devices are appropriate for highly urbanized areas where space is limited. The Gross Solids Removal Devices can be designed to accommodate vehicular loading. Maintenance of the devices involves the removal of the solids either by using a vacuum truck or other equipment. The installation of Gross Solids Removal Devices may require modification of storm water conveyance structures; however, these units would generally be sited below grade and within existing storm drain infrastructure. The installation of Gross Solids Removal Devices is not expected to require additional land nor is there a need to displace existing housing. To the extent that these devices, if employed, may conceivably require the displacement of available housing, it is not reasonably foreseeable that the responsible agencies would install such a device. Rather, an agency would foreseeably opt for non-structural control measures, such as enforcing litter ordinances.

It is not reasonably foreseeable that the installation and maintenance of trash nets or catch basin inserts would induce population growth, displace people or existing housing or create a demand for additional housing. These units are installed entirely within existing storm drain infrastructure.

It is not reasonably foreseeable that increased street sweeping would induce population growth, displace people or existing housing or create a demand for additional housing. Current street sweeping, whether infrequent or frequent, does not have this effect. It is not reasonably foreseeable that enforcement of litter laws would induce population growth, displace people or existing housing or create a demand for additional housing. Current litter laws do not have this effect. It is not reasonably foreseeable that public education and ordinances would induce population growth, displace people or existing housing or create a demand for additional housing.

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

**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 ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/> |

Because of the expected location of the proposed project and reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance, it is not expected to be in the vicinity of or affect the objectives for schools, parks, or other public facilities. Potential impacts to fire and police protection public services due to implementation of the proposed final Trash Amendments are discussed in Section 6.11 Public Services of the Draft proposed Final Staff Report.

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

**RECREATION.** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The proposed final Trash Amendments would not have a substantial impact on recreation.

Treatment controls (e.g., vortex separation systems, catch basin inserts, etc.), can be installed at or below grade in existing storm drain systems, which should not require any additional land. Therefore, it is not reasonably foreseeable that park land, recreational or open space areas will be needed for the installation of structural controls.

Installation of treatment controls may temporarily impact the usage of existing recreational sites. For instance, bike lanes or parking locations for recreational facilities may be temporarily unavailable during installation of structural controls. These potential impacts will be short in duration and have a less-than-significant effect on recreation.

It is not reasonably foreseeable that increased street sweeping, enforcement of litter laws, ordinances, or public education would impact the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities. In addition, implementation of the proposed final Trash Amendments is designed to improve the quality of the affected water bodies and associated beaches and shorelines. This will likely create a positive impact and increase recreational opportunities throughout the watersheds.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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

- |  |                          |                                     |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

Potential impacts to transportation/traffic due to implementation of the proposed **final** Trash Amendments are discussed in Section 6.12 Transportation/Traffic of the **Draft proposed Final** Staff Report.

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

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

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

- |  |                          |                                     |                                     |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input 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 type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Potential impacts related to storm drainage to implementation of the proposed **final** Trash Amendments are discussed in Section 6.13 Utilities/Service Systems of the **Draft proposed Final** Staff Report.

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

**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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The proposed **final** Trash Amendments would neither degrade the environment nor adversely affect cultural resources. The installation of structural controls may

temporarily impact environmental resources, but as discussed in Section 6 of the ~~Draft~~ proposed Final Staff Report, implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the draft SED should reduce potential impacts to less-than significant levels.

As discussed in Section 7.2 Cumulative Impacts Analysis of the ~~Draft proposed Final~~ Staff Report, adoption of the proposed final Trash Amendments would not result in significant cumulatively considerable impacts with implementation of mitigation measures. The overall effect of the proposed final Trash Amendments would be a reduction in the amount of trash entering the State's water bodies thereby improving water quality and protecting the beneficial uses of those waters.

The proposed final Trash Amendments would not, in any way, cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. Where temporary effects have been identified in the ~~Draft proposed Final~~ Staff Report (i.e., transportation/traffic), mitigation measures have also been identified to reduce those impacts to less-than-significant levels.