CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD CENTRAL COAST REGION 895 AEROVISTA PLACE, SUITE 101 SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA

RESOLUTION R3-2008-0006

General Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements for Onsite Wastewater Systems

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Region (hereafter Central Coast Water Board) finds:

- 1. California Water Code (Water Code) Section 13260(a) requires that any person discharging waste or proposing to discharge waste within any region that could affect the quality of the waters of the State, other than into a community sewer system, shall file with the appropriate Regional Board a report of waste discharge (ROWD) containing such information and data as may be required by the Central Coast Water Board, unless the Central Coast Water Board waives such requirement.
- California Water Code Section 13263 requires the Central Coast Water Board to prescribe waste discharge requirements, or waive waste discharge requirements, for the discharge. The waste discharge requirements must implement relevant water quality control plans and the Water Code.
- 3. California Water Code §13269 authorizes the Central Coast Water Board to waive the submittal of reports of waste discharge and waste discharge requirements for specific types of discharges where such a waiver is consistent with applicable state and regional water quality control plans and is in the public interest.
- 4. California Water Code §13269 requires that waivers shall be conditional and may be terminated at any time by the Central Coast Water Board. Waivers may be granted for discharges of waste to land, but may not be granted for discharges of waste subject to the NPDES requirements of the federal Clean Water Act. The waiver must also include monitoring unless the Regional Board determines that the discharges do not pose a significant threat to water quality.
- 5. Waivers granted for discharges that do not pose a significant threat to water quality, and where such waivers are in the public interest, enable staff resources to be used more effectively and avoid unnecessary expenditures of limited resources.
- 6. Central Coast Water Board staff will develop and implement a waiver tracking and compliance program.
- 7. Issuance of a waiver does not override other more stringent local, state, or federal regulations prescribed by other agencies or departments.
- 8. Although a discharge may qualify for waiver enrollment, the Central Coast Water Board retains the right to regulate that discharge through other programs or Central Coast Water Board actions (such as enforcement orders, individual waste discharge

Item No. 10 Attachment 1 May 9, 2008 Meeting Waiver of WDRs for Onsite Wastewater System Discharges (Resolution No. R3-2008-0006) requirements, general orders, etc.). The Central Coast Water Board may terminate a waiver at any time and require the discharge to obtain waste discharge requirements or terminate the discharge.

- 9. Onsite wastewater systems have been used as a form of wastewater treatment and disposal for many decades. Currently, the number of individual residential and small community onsite wastewater systems in the Central Coast Region exceeds 100,000. In many instances, the discharge from onsite wastewater systems does not adversely affect the beneficial uses of groundwater or surface water quality due to favorable site conditions, adequate system design, and ongoing management practices.
- 10. When improperly sited, improperly designed, or improperly managed, discharges from onsite wastewater systems may cause or contribute to degradation of water quality. The Basin Plan Implementation Program includes criteria to ensure long-term water quality protection in areas where onsite wastewater systems are used. Onsite wastewater systems located, designed, installed and managed in accordance with the Basin Plan criteria are not expected to cause or contribute to water quality impacts.
- 11. Sections (3) and (4) of this Resolution identify the types and conditions of discharges for which waivers are granted by this Resolution. These discharges will not have a significant effect on the quality of waters of the State provided the conditions of this waiver are met.
- 12. Appropriately developed and implemented memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between the Central Coast Water Board and local permitting agencies (e.g., counties and cities) provide practical and enforceable tools to compel compliance with the Basin Plan criteria for onsite systems and ensure water quality protection. Such MOUs allow the Central Coast Water Board to issue a waiver of waste discharge requirements for onsite sewage treatment systems regulated by local agencies which enter into such MOUs.
- 13. This Resolution waives the requirement that certain individual onsite wastewater system dischargers submit ROWD and obtain waste discharge requirements from the Central Coast Water Board, if the discharge is regulated by a local agency that has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Water Board that meets the conditions of the Basin Plan and complies with the criteria set forth in the Implementation Program for Onsite Wastewater Systems in the Basin Plan.
- 14. Such a waiver is consistent with the Basin Plan and is in the public interest, if conditioned upon a local agency entering into an individual MOU and compliance with the criteria. By entering into an MOU, a local agency commits to ensuring that its onsite wastewater system permitting program is substantially equivalent to the Basin Plan and any statewide standards adopted pursuant to California Water Code §13291. The adoption of this Conditional Waiver is also in the public interest because: (1) it was adopted in compliance with Water Code Sections 13260, 13263, and 13269 and other applicable law; (2) it requires compliance with the Basin Plan criteria that are developed to be protective of waters of the state; (3) it includes conditions that are intended to reduce and prevent pollution and nuisance and protect the beneficial uses of the waters of the State; (4) it contains more specific

and more stringent conditions for protection of water quality compared to the existing Basin Plan criteria; and (5) given the magnitude of the number of persons who operate onsite systems, it provides for an efficient and effective use of limited Central Coast Water Board resources.

- 15. This Conditional Waiver does not impose monitoring and reporting requirements for each discharge. The types of discharges subject to this Conditional Waiver are not expected to pose a significant threat to water quality if the Basin Plan criteria are properly implemented. The Water Board's Executive Officer may impose monitoring and reporting requirements as authorized pursuant to Water Code section 13267 on any discharger subject to this Conditional Waiver.
- 16. State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California (Resolution No. 68-16) requires Regional Water Boards, in regulating the discharge of waste, to maintain high quality waters of the State until it is demonstrated that any change in quality will be consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State, will not unreasonably affect beneficial uses, and will not result in water quality less than that described in a Regional Water Board's policies (e.g., quality that exceeds applicable water quality standards). Resolution No. 68-16 also states, in part:

Any activity which produces or may produce a waste or increased volume or concentration of waste and which discharges or proposes to discharge to existing high quality waters will be required to meet waste discharge requirements which will result in best practicable treatment and control of the discharge necessary to assure that (a) a pollution or nuisance will not occur and (b) the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained.

- 17. This Resolution implements Resolution 68-16. Dischargers that could be subject to this conditional waiver will be required to comply with the Basin Plan criteria that are expected to prevent degradation of waters of the state, prevent pollution or nuisance, and implement best practicable treatment or control. The Basin Plan Implementation Program prohibits systems that do not meet the criteria.
- 18. At this time, it is appropriate to adopt a waiver of waste discharge requirements for onsite wastewater systems that fit within the Basin Plan criteria because: 1) the discharges have the same or similar waste from the same or similar operations and use the same or similar treatment methods and management practices; 2) the discharges will be regulated by local agencies in compliance with the Basin Plan criteria.
- 19. In addition, it is appropriate to regulate onsite wastewater systems with a Conditional Waiver rather than individual waste discharge requirements in order to simplify and streamline the regulatory process. There are more than 100,000 individual onsite wastewater systems in the Central Coast Region and it would not be practicable for the Water Board to issue individual waste discharge requirements. These systems are already being regulated by local permitting agencies applying Basin Plan criteria.
- 20. Central Coast Water Board will evaluate local permitting agencies at least once every five years to ensure their onsite wastewater system approval practices

- consistently implement Basin Plan criteria for onsite wastewater systems and ensure water quality protection.
- 21. Central Coast Water Board staff followed appropriate procedures to satisfy the environmental documentation requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act [in accordance with §15307 and §15308 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR)].
- 22. The Central Coast Water Board has reviewed the Initial Study and Negative Declaration concerning this Resolution prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and concurs that the action to adopt this Resolution waiving waste discharge requirements with respect to onsite wastewater systems will not have a significant impact on the environment.
- 23. On May 9, 2008, the Central Coast Water Board held a public hearing and considered all the evidence and comments concerning this matter. Notice of this hearing was given to all interested parties in accordance with CCR, Title 14, §15072.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED

- 1. The Central Coast Water Board's Executive Officer is authorized to enroll and terminate enrollment in the waiver granted by this Resolution.
- 2. The Central Coast Water Board's Executive Officer is authorized to approve and execute, on behalf of the Central Coast Water Board, individual MOUs with local agencies in the Region based substantially on the requirements specified in Chapter 4, Section VIII.D of the Basin Plan (sections pertaining to onsite wastewater systems). Individual MOUs shall commit the local agency to amending its municipal code and onsite wastewater system program, if necessary, in order to be substantially equivalent to the Basin Plan. If and when statewide criteria are adopted pursuant to California Water Code §13291, the MOUs will be reviewed to determine if it needs to be modified. Individual MOUs shall incorporate additional measures to be taken by the local agency to identify and address areas of degraded groundwater or surface water quality, where onsite wastewater systems are a potential source of pollution.
- 3. Conditions for Waiver- Waste discharge requirements [California Water Code §13263(a)] are waived for discharges from onsite wastewater systems sited, designed, managed and maintained in a manner consistent with control actions specified in the Basin Plan, Chapter 4, Section VIII.D. Documentation of consistency with each control action shall be provided in a report of waste discharge (ROWD) submitted to the Central Coast Water Board for approval. Each ROWD submittal shall be accompanied by a fee corresponding to the lowest applicable fee for waste discharge requirements (threat and complexity rating of III-C) identified in the State Water Board's fee schedule. Applicants seeking enrollment in this waiver are required to comply with conditions specified in a Water Board-approved onsite management program implemented by the local permitting authority, when such a plan is implemented.
- 4. <u>Conditions for waived ROWD requirements</u> Requirements for submittal of ROWD, issuance of waste discharge requirements, and enrollment notification [California

Water Code §13260(a) and (b), §13263(a), and §13264(a)] are waived for discharges from onsite wastewater systems sited, designed, managed and maintained in a manner consistent with a Water Board-approved onsite management program implemented by the local permitting authority, which also implements an authorizing MOU with the Central Coast Water Board. Provided all conditions are met, these dischargers need not submit applications to the Central Coast Water Board, pay fees, or receive waiver enrollment notification.

- 5. The Central Coast Water Board's Executive Officer may tentatively enroll proposed discharges not listed in No. 3 (above), provided the discharge meets all general conditions listed in No. 3 and any additional site-specific or discharge-specific conditions prescribed by the Executive Officer. These discharges require a report of waste discharge including a one-time fee equal to the minimum annual fee identified in the State Water Board's fee schedule. Tentative enrollments will be brought before the Central Coast Water Board at regularly scheduled meetings for formal approval.
- 6. The Central Coast Water Board hereby adopts the Initial Study and Negative Declaration regarding waivers of waste discharge requirements for onsite wastewater systems. The Executive Officer will file a Notice of Determination with the State Clearinghouse as required by the California Code of Regulations.
- I, Roger W. Briggs, Executive Officer of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Region, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Region, on May 9, 2008.

Executive Officer
 Date

Attachment:

A - CEQA Report (including the Environmental Checklist)

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION

(RESOLUTION NO. R3-2008-0006)

The Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Coast Water Board) is proposing to adopt a Resolution that would waive the requirement in the Water Code to obtain waste discharge requirements for discharges from onsite wastewater systems that are consistent with criteria set forth in the *Water Quality Control Plan, Central Coast Basin* (Basin Plan) and the local agency has an agreement with the Central Coast Water Board. The Basin Plan serves as the cornerstone for protection of waters of the State through identification of beneficial uses of surface and ground waters, establishment of water quality objectives to protect beneficial uses, and establishment of an implementation plan to achieve those objectives.

This Report satisfies the documentation requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines [§15251, Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR)]. It contains the following:

- 1. A description of proposed activity and proposed alternatives,
- 2. An environmental checklist and a description of the proposed activity,
- 3. An environmental evaluation, and
- 4. A determination with respect to significant environmental impacts.

The environmental analysis contained in this report and accompanying documents, including the Environmental Checklist, the staff report and the responses to comments complies with the requirements of the State Water Board's certified regulatory process, as set forth in CCR, Title 23, §3775 et seq. All public comments were considered.

I. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTIVITY

The purpose of this Resolution is to adopt a conditional waiver of waste discharge requirements for discharges from onsite wastewater systems and to update the implementation policy in the Basin Plan with respect to onsite wastewater system requirements. Historically, discharge from conventional onsite wastewater systems has been regulated by local permitting agencies (cities and counties). The Central Coast Water Board's general waiver of waste discharge requirements for such systems was implemented through multi-agency memoranda of understanding (MOUs), and local permitting agencies implemented Basin Plan criteria for onsite systems through their own permits. Pursuant to Water Code §13269(b)(2), the Central Coast Water Board's general waiver for discharges from onsite wastewater systems expired on June 30, 2004. Since expiration of the waiver, discharges from onsite systems have not been formally authorized by the Central Coast Water Board. Formal discharge authorization is required pursuant to California Water Code §13264. The proposed Resolution No. R3-2008-0006 establishes regulatory oversight, management, and monitoring of onsite systems in a manner that is clear, streamlined and protective of water quality.

By adopting the proposed resolution, Water Board oversight of onsite system discharges will be streamlined and clarified in a manner expected to result in improved long-term water quality protection in areas served by onsite wastewater systems. The proposed resolution is also expected to improve consistency and customer service by reducing the need for staff resources utilized in a manner redundant with local jurisdictions. Adoption of the proposed resolution will complete a Triennial Review list priority task, which has been backlogged for many years.

Alternatives to this Project

1. Adoption of an alternative waiver policy

The Central Coast Water Board could adopt a waiver policy for onsite wastewater systems with conditions different from those proposed. This alternative is not recommended as it could result in implementation of only some of the Basin Plan criteria for onsite wastewater systems and would not achieve the goals of effective long-term water quality protection in a clear and efficient manner. Adoption of a different waiver policy can only be addressed relative to specified alternate proposals. Such discussion is addressed in the response to comments included in the staff report. This alternative is not recommended.

2. Adopt individual or general waste discharge requirements

The Central Coast Water Board could adopt individual or general waste discharge requirements for onsite wastewater systems. This alternative is not recommended. Individual waste discharge requirements would overwhelm the staff resources as there are many hundreds of such systems in the Region. General waste discharge requirements are not necessary because the local agencies are best situated to regulate onsite wastewater systems in compliance with the Basin Plan. The proposed conditional waiver requiring compliance with Basin Plan criteria provides appropriate protection of waters of the state.

3. Take no action

Formal discharge authorization is required pursuant to California Water Code §13264. Currently, no such authorization is in place. If no action is taken, the current situation would continue, which does not provide adequate protection of water quality or compliance with the California Water Code. This alternative is not recommended.

II. APPLICABLE INFORMATON

1. Lead Agency Name and Address

Central Coast Water Board 895 Aerovista Place, Suite 101 San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-7906

2. Contact Person and Phone Number: Sorrel Marks (805) 549-3595

3. **Project Location:** Central Coast Region: including Monterey, Santa Cruz, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Barbara Counties; and portions of Santa Clara, San Benito, San Mateo, and Ventura Counties.

4. Project Sponsor's Name and Address

Central Coast Water Board 895 Aerovista Place, Suite 101 San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-7906

5. Other Public Agencies whose Approval is Required

Although formal approval by local jurisdictions is not required for this waiver policy, cooperative implementation by local permitting authorities (cities, counties, community services districts) is necessary to effectively protect water quality. Local jurisdictions likely to be affected by the proposed project include: Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and Ventura Counties, and the cities and special districts therein.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

III. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

		Potentially	Less Than Significant	Less Than	No
		Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporation	Significant Impact	Impact
1.					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				\boxtimes
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, But not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings with a state scenic highway?				\boxtimes
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				\boxtimes
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area				\boxtimes
2.	AGRICULTURE RESOURCES 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?				\boxtimes

		·,			
(c)	which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				\boxtimes
3.	AIR QUALITY Would the project:			<u> </u>	
a)	applicable air quality plan?				\boxtimes
b)	substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				\boxtimes
c)	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)	concentrations?				\boxtimes
e)	number of people?				
4.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
а)	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?				\boxtimes
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?				\boxtimes
c)	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?				\boxtimes
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?				\boxtimes
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				\boxtimes
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?				
5.	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?			\boxtimes
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			\boxtimes
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			\boxtimes
6.	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:			\boxtimes
	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.			\boxtimes
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			\square
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			\boxtimes
	iv) Landslides?			\boxtimes
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			\boxtimes
ပဲ	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?			\boxtimes
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?			\boxtimes
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?			\boxtimes
7.	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?			\boxtimes
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?			\boxtimes
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			\boxtimes
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?			\boxtimes

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?		\boxtimes
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?		\boxtimes
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		\boxtimes
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?		
7.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:		
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		
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)?		
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?		\boxtimes
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?		\boxtimes
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?		\boxtimes
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		
g) 	as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?		\boxtimes
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?		\boxtimes
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?		\boxtimes
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?		

8.	LAND USE AND PLANNING Would the				T
	project:		İ		
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			1	
-	mitigating an environmental effect?			<u> </u>	
(c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation				
9.	plan or natural community conservation plan?				- 23
_	MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:			<u> </u>	<u></u>
(a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and	<u></u>			
	the residents of the state?		[]		
b)					-
"	-important mineral resource recovery site				
	delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or				
	other land use plan?				
10.	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				1
	groundborne vibration or groundborne noise	П		! □	\boxtimes
	levels?				E-3
(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		_	l ˈ	
	ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above				$ \boxtimes $
-	levels existing without the project?				<u> </u>
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan				
	or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within				1
	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?				
10.	POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the				
	project:	i	i		
a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area,				
	either directly (for example, by proposing new				
	homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example,	السا	<u>.</u>		
	through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing,				
	necessitating the construction of replacement				\boxtimes
	housing elsewhere?				
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people,			 _	
	necessitating the construction of replacement	\sqcup			\boxtimes
	housing elsewhere?		i		I

					r
11.	PUBLIC SERVICES Would the project result in:				
a)	Substantial adverse physical impacts associated				
۵)	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:				
b)	Fire protection?				\square
c)	Police protection?				
d)	Schools?				\boxtimes
e)	Parks?				
f)	Other public facilities?				
12.	RECREATION:				
a)	Would the project increase the use of existing				
	neighborhood and regional parks or other				
	recreational facilities such that substantial physical				\boxtimes
	deterioration of the facility would occur or be				
	accelerated?				·
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or				
	require the construction or expansion of				\square
	recreational facilities which might have an adverse]	
	physical effect on the environment?				
13.	TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the				
	project:				
a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in	i			
	relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of				
	the street system (i.e., result in a substantial				\boxtimes
	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				\boxtimes
	location that results in substantial safety risks?				
d) :	Substantially increase hazards due to a design				
	feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous				\boxtimes
	intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm				
	equipment)?				
<u>e)</u>	Result in inadequate emergency access?	닏			- 월
<u>f)</u>	Result in inadequate parking capacity?			Ц	
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs				
	supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				\boxtimes
	TUTOOTIS DICYCLE FACKSTZ	I			ŀ

44		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
14	. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project:				
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				\boxtimes
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?				\boxtimes
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?				\boxtimes
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				\boxtimes
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?				\boxtimes
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				\boxtimes
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				\boxtimes
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?				\boxtimes
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)?				\boxtimes
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			- 🗆	\boxtimes

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (of checklist questions answered Potentially Significant Impact, Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation, or Less than Significant Impact): Not applicable.

V. PRELIMINARY STAFF DETERMINATION

For

The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect of and, therefore, no alternatives or mitigation measures are pro-			
The proposed project MAY have a significant or potentially significant effect on the environment, and therefore alternatives and mitigation measures have been evaluated.			
Signature	Date		

Printed Name