STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL COAST REGION
895 Aerovista Place Suite 101
San Luis Obispo, Ca 93401-7906

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT "SUBSTITUTE DOCUMENT" REPORT FOR BASIN PLAN AMENDMENT

(RESOLUTION NO. RB-2005-0106)

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Region intends to adopt the **San Luis Obispo Creek Total Maximum Daily Load and Implementation Plan for Nitrate-Nitrogen** into the Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan), Central Coast Region. All basin plan amendments are subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). However, the State Board's water quality planning process has been certified by the Secretary for Resources as exempt from, CEQA's requirement for preparation of an environmental impact report or negative declaration and initial study (California Public Resources Code Section 21080.5, California Code of Regulation (CCR) Title 14, §15251(g)). State Board Regulations [23 CCR 3720 et seq.] describe the environmental documents required for planning actions. These documents are: a written report (Attachment B of this Basin Plan Amendment Package), a draft of the amendment (Attachment A of this Basin Plan Amendment Package), an Environmental Checklist Form [23 CCR 3776], and an alternatives analysis [23 CCR 3777].

This attachment includes the Environmental Checklist Form. Following the Environmental Checklist is an Environmental Evaluation of "Less than Significant Impacts" identified in the checklist, an alternatives analysis, and a Determination of no impact relative to this action.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings with a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. **AGRICULTURE 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. -- 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 and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is not attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?				
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. 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 pursuant to §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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. 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 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.	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including	☐	☐	☐	☒

liquefaction?				
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste-water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?				
	h. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -Would the project:				
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Substantially deplete ground water supplies or interfere substantially with ground water recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local ground water 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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒
	i. LAND USE AND PLANNING Would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
k. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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 or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
l. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement	☐	☐	☐	☒

housing elsewhere?				
m. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for 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:	☐	☐	☐	☒
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
n. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
o. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	☒

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
p. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒
q. 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)?				
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒

ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

No impacts are noted for all items in the environmental checklist. It is therefore unlikely that there will be negative environmental impacts resulting from the project.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS DISCUSSION

The following section discusses the preferred alternative (i.e., this proposed Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)), a No Action Alternative, and other alternatives.

a. Preferred Alternative

The Preferred Alternative is the adoption of the San Luis Obispo Creek Total Maximum Daily Load and Implementation Plan for Nitrate-Nitrogen as a Basin Plan Amendment. Nitrate-Nitrogen (nitrate-N) load is allocated to responsible parties and requires load reductions from two source categories, i.e., a point source and irrigated agriculture lands. Implementation of actions and monitoring will occur pursuant to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System existing permits, the Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges to Irrigated Lands (Conditional Waiver), and authority granted to the Regional Board Executive Officer through the California Water Code. Regional Board staff will conduct reviews to evaluate the success of implementation actions aimed at reducing loading to achieve the allocations. Implementation is required pursuant to existing regulatory mechanisms. No new regulatory actions will be required to implement the TMDL. A period of seven years of implementation is the anticipated time required to achieve the allocations necessary to achieve the TMDL. Significant adverse environmental effects are not anticipated from this preferred alternative.

b. Alternative - No Action

The No Action alternative implies that the Regional Board would not adopt the TMDL, numeric targets, TMDL implementation plan, or monitoring program. The No Action alternative does not comply with the Clean Water Act requiring the development of TMDLs for impaired waters, nor does it meet the purpose of the proposed action, which is to comply with Basin Plan water quality objectives and restore beneficial uses affected by nitrate-N.

c. Alternative – Decreased Regulatory Oversight

The Decreased Regulatory Oversight Alternative is defined as the proposed project with an Implementation Plan of lesser regulatory oversight, including implementation utilizing voluntary measures to achieve the load reductions necessary to achieve the TMDL. This alternative would be in conflict with existing federal and state requirements regulating discharges to surface water. A significant portion of the sources of nitrate-N identified fall under discharges regulated through the federal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System or through the existing Conditional Waiver and therefore requires a level of regulatory oversight articulated in the preferred alternative.

d. Alternative – Longer Implementation Period

An implementation period longer than the proposed seven years would not be acceptable because it would be in conflict with existing mechanisms available regulating effluent limits of point discharges established through this TMDL. In addition, an implementation period longer than the proposed seven years would not be acceptable, since it would fail to resolve water quality impacts at the earliest practicable date, thereby offering less protection of beneficial uses in San Luis Obispo Creek Watershed.

e. Alternative – Shorter Implementation Period

An implementation period of less than seven years is not practicable. The identified responsible parties require several years to fully implement the actions necessary to achieve the required allocations; economic pressures on responsible parties bind the rate of implementation. In addition, the full positive effect of implementation actions will not immediately be realized in stream water quality, but rather will occur gradually during and after implementation.

f. Alternative – More Stringent Numeric Target

A more stringent numeric target is not necessary to meet water quality objectives or to protect beneficial uses.

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

__X__ I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment.

____I find that the proposed project may have a significant adverse impact on the environment. However, there are feasible alternatives and/or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse impact. These alternatives and mitigation measures are discussed in the attached written report.

____ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment. There are no feasible alternatives and/or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts. See the attached written report for a discussion of this determination.

_____
Signature

_____
Date