

9.1.4 Environmental Checklist

The Environmental Checklist and discussion that follows is based on questions provided in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, which focus on impacts to various environmental resources, such as air quality, cultural resources, land use, traffic, etc. The Environmental Checklist focuses on the implementation activities described in Table 9-1. Some of the TMDL Implementation Plan actions solely involve planning or assessment, public outreach and education, and water quality monitoring. These activities are not evaluated in this analysis because they do not cause a direct physical change in the environment or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

- 1. Project Title:** Basin Plan Amendment to Establish Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for Bacteria in Pillar Point Harbor and Venice Beach
- 2. Lead Agency Name and Address:** California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region
1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400
Oakland, CA 94612
- 3. Contact Person and Phone:** Barbara Baginska, (510) 622-2474
- 4. Project Location:** San Mateo County
- 5. Project Sponsor's Name & Address:** California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region
1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400
Oakland, CA 94612
- 6. General Plan Designation:** Not Applicable
- 7. Zoning:** Not Applicable
- 8. Description of Project:**

The project is a Basin Plan amendment to establish a bacteria TMDL and implementation plan for Pillar Point Harbor and Venice Beach.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The proposed Basin Plan amendment would affect the beaches in Pillar Point Harbor and Venice Beach, as described in Section 2 of the Staff Report. Pillar Point Harbor is located in the unincorporated coastal community of Princeton, north of the City of Half Moon Bay. Venice Beach stretches between Venice Boulevard and Beach Avenue, which intersect with Cabrillo Highway halfway between the City of Half Moon Bay to the south and Pillar Point Harbor to the north. Implementation will involve the beaches and the upland areas that drain to the Harbor and Venice Beach. Pillar Point Harbor drains approximately 6 square miles and includes inflows from Denniston, St. Augustine and Deer creeks watersheds, which comprise large open space areas in the upper reaches (74 percent), and include mixed-use areas with commercial, airport, residential (21 percent) and agricultural areas (5 percent) at the lower reaches. Venice Beach receives inflow from Frenchmans Creek and Pilarcitos Creek which together drain approximately 30 square miles of watershed. The land use is predominantly open space and forest (87.4 percent), followed by low and medium density development (8.9 percent) and agriculture/pasture (1.7 percent).

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:

The State Water Board, the California Office of Administrative Law, and the U.S. EPA must approve the Basin Plan amendment following adoption by the Water Board.

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

On July 1, 2019, we reviewed the list of California Native American tribes who requested consultations under the AB 52. We found no Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area who have requested consultations.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

We have determined that the project would not have any significant adverse impacts on the environment; hence, there are no physical, biological, social and/or economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project, except for less than significant impacts identified below.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture and Forestry	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Energy
<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazards and Hazardous Materials
<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tribal Cultural Resources
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wildfire	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance

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

I. AESTHETICS: Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

- a) Any physical changes to the aesthetic environment because of the Bacteria TMDL would be small in scale. None of the reasonably foreseeable compliance methods identified in Table 9-1 are expected to have an adverse impact on a scenic vista. No actions or projects associated with implementation of the TMDL would result in tall or massive structures that could obstruct views from, or of scenic vistas.
- b) Reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance identified in Table 9-1 do not require building of structures that would damage natural or human made resources to the extent that it would impede the scenic quality of the area or scenic resources associated with state scenic highways, and therefore will not result in adverse aesthetic impacts to state scenic highways or scenic resources.
- c) Actions to implement the TMDL would not substantially affect or degrade the existing visual character or quality of any site or its surroundings because physical changes to the aesthetic environment would be small in scale. The implementation actions will not conflict with the applicable zoning or regulations governing scenic quality.
- d) Actions and projects that could result from the TMDL would not include new lighting or installation of large structures that could generate reflected sunlight or glare, and therefore do not result in adverse light and glare impacts.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California 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 the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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? | <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)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <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"/> |

a-e) The TMDL would mainly affect urban or developed land in the area that drains to Pillar Point Harbor and Venice Beach and would not convert land designated as Prime, Unique, or Farmland of Statewide Importance by the California Resources Agency. The TMDL would not affect existing agricultural zoning or any aspects of Williamson Act contract nor would it result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses or loss of forest land. Therefore, no impacts would result.

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

- | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

a) None of the reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance will result in any conflicts with or obstruction to the implementation of the applicable air quality plans. The TMDL would not cause any significant changes in population or employment, it is not expected to generate ongoing traffic-related emissions or require construction of any permanent emissions sources. For these reasons, no permanent change in air emissions would occur, and no air quality impacts would result.

b) Implementation of stormwater BMPs and repair and replacement of sewer system components could result in temporary construction-related emissions. However, these emissions would not violate any air quality standard. Nor would these projects involve the construction of any permanent emissions sources or generate ongoing traffic-related emissions. Construction and minor earthmoving resulting from implementation actions in the proposed TMDL would be short-term and would likely be small-scale. Standard dust control construction management practices should mitigate inhalable particulate matter from soil disturbance activities such as grading and excavation. If specific construction projects were proposed to comply with the TMDL, such projects would comply with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's requirements and implement readily available measures to prevent adverse impacts, such as watering active construction areas, covering trucks hauling soil, and applying water or

soil stabilizers on unpaved areas. Therefore, the TMDL would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to any air quality violation. Temporary construction-related air quality impacts would be less than significant. Because the TMDL would not involve the construction of any permanent emissions sources, it would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment of air quality standards. Overall, less than significant air quality impact would result.

- c) Because the TMDL would not require the construction of any permanent emissions sources but rather involves short-term and discrete construction activities, it would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. No air quality impact would result..
- d) The Bacteria TMDL would include actions to manage manure at horse facilities so that animal waste does not enter the beaches. Manure management activities could include the collection, storage and transport of manure which could result in odor. However, because manure stockpiling would be limited to areas of low-density population, possible odors would not affect substantial numbers of people and impacts would be less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 DFG or USFWS?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 DFG or USFWS?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally-protected wetlands (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 wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) There are Federal and State listed endangered and threatened animals which are known to be present in the vicinity of the project area. Such species could potentially be temporarily impacted by measures implemented to comply with the proposed project. However, actions proposed by the TMDL are likely to be small in scale and/or located in Pillar Point Harbor or other developed areas. Furthermore, actions to reduce bacteria discharges to the Harbor and Beach will in many cases have the effect of reducing other pollutants, such as nutrients, which will help to improve water quality and aquatic habitats. Therefore, no adverse impacts on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species would result, and the overall impact will be less than significant. b) Presence of sensitive species and habitat must be assessed on a project by project basis. Implementation compliance measures that involve repair of sewage systems or minor construction are 				

not expected to have a significant impact on sensitive natural communities because they would mostly be located in already disturbed areas away from creeks and riparian habitats. Therefore, the TMDL would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications to sensitive natural communities. In addition, in fulfilling its regulatory program responsibilities in connection with work that may occur near waters of the state, the Regional Water Board includes requirements to avoid and minimize impacts on riparian ecosystems or other sensitive natural communities. Such requirements include but are not limited to pre-construction surveys; construction buffers and setbacks; restrictions on construction during sensitive periods of time; employment of on-site biologists to oversee work; and avoidance of construction in known sensitive habitat areas or relocation and restoration of sensitive habitats, but only if avoidance is impossible.

- c) The TMDL does not include construction of new fill in riparian or wetland areas. Implementation actions are likely to occur in existing roadways and facilities and as such they would result in less than significant adverse impacts on wetlands.
- d) Reasonably foreseeable compliance methods will not interfere with migratory fish or wildlife because structural compliance methods are not required within stream beds. Also, reasonably foreseeable compliance methods are not anticipated to be spatially large-scale, contiguous, or numerous enough to block fish or wildlife migration or use of wildlife nursery sites.
- e-f) The TMDL does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as trees. Projects to comply with the TMDL would not require tree removal in riparian zones or other sensitive habitats and would not result in the physical alteration of natural environment such that there would be any adverse effects on federally-or State-listed species. The proposed actions would not conflict with any Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Programs, or Midcoast Local Coastal Program and other local policies designed to protect biological resources. Based on the range of avoidance and minimization measures available, the impacts to Biological Resources from compliance measures to address fecal indicator bacteria impairment are less than significant.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-c) This proposed TMDL is not expected to have an impact on cultural resources, because implementation actions would not require construction in areas with known cultural resources, changes to, or demolition of historic structures. Likely TMDL implementation actions by municipalities to control bacteria loads, such as creation of green infrastructure or placement of stormwater treatment structures, would include only minor construction in existing roadways and stormwater facilities and would not require changes to historic buildings or structures.

VI. ENERGY: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

- a) Any minor amounts of electricity or natural gas that may be consumed as a result of the TMDL project construction or repairs would be temporary and negligible and would not have an adverse effect; therefore, no impacts would occur.
- b) Energy conservation measures protocols would be used to ensure energy would not be used in a wasteful manner or conflict with adopted energy conservation plans, policies or regulations.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project: Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

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 wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- a) Implementation of the TMDL would not require construction of habitable structures or addition of new population; therefore, it would not result in any human safety risks related to fault rupture, seismic ground-shaking, ground failure, or landslides.
- b) Action to comply with the TMDL may result in minor construction and earthmoving such as to repair faulty septic systems. Such activities are not likely to result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil because they are small in scale.
- c) Actions to comply with the TMDL would generally be located in existing disturbed areas such as marinas, streets, backyards, and horse facilities. While these areas may contain localized areas that are prone to instability, the type of construction that would be required under the TMDL, such as

replacement of pipes and facility upgrades, would be small in scale and would be very unlikely to trigger land instability. No adverse impacts to local geologic conditions, including on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse are expected to occur as a result of this project.

- d) Construction of buildings (as defined in the Uniform Building Code) or any habitable structures to implement the TMDL is not reasonably foreseeable. Minor grading could occur in areas with expansive soils but this activity would not create a substantial risk to life or property. Therefore, the TMDL would not result in impacts related to expansive soils or risks to life or property.
- e) While the TMDL requires evaluation, inspection, and repair or replacement of existing faulty septic systems, some may require construction of new septic systems. Affected soils will be capable of supporting the use of new septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Further, any such project must undergo site specific soil testing to ensure it is capable of supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impacts from new septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would result from the project.
- f) The implementation actions will be limited by both volume and geographic location and will not occur in areas where known unique paleontological resources or geological features are present. There would be no impacts.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Implementation of compliance measures at the project level could result in a temporary/intermittent increase in greenhouse gases related to exhaust from equipment and vehicles used during construction, repair, or manure management at small horse facilities. However, these emissions will be limited and short in duration, and would result in less than significant impacts overall. b) All structural or nonstructural implementation measures would need to be implemented in a manner consistent with plans, policies or regulations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the greenhouse gas emissions and no impact would occur. 				

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- 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) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

- a) Implementation of TMDL is not expected to involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, no impacts from the use, transport or disposal of hazardous materials would result.
- b) Actions to implement the TMDL, such as repair of pipelines, and cleaning of stormwater outfalls are not expected to result in upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials. Sewage is not considered a hazardous material. Laws and regulations restrict handling and disposal of sewage during repair and replacement of holding tanks and sewer pipes. Small amounts of cement, grease or solvents may be used for repairs or minor construction. These materials would be handled in accordance with relevant laws and regulations, which would minimize hazards to the public or the environment, and the potential for accidents or upsets. Therefore, hazardous waste transport and disposal would not create any significant public or environmental hazard or environmental impact.
- c) As indicated in response to item VIII b), above, actions to implement the TMDL would not be associated with emission of hazardous materials or handling of significant quantities of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials or substances. Therefore, no impact from hazardous materials would occur within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- d) There are no sites located within the project area identified on the hazardous waste and substance material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (Cortese List). Further, all minor construction and earth moving activities will take place in either rural or farmland areas or within shallow ditches in municipal utilities right of ways. Therefore, minor construction that may be undertaken to implement the TMDL would have no impact to hazardous waste sites.
- e) The TMDL does not include actions that would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working within two miles of the Half Moon Bay Airport or vicinity.
- f) Hazardous waste management activities resulting from the TMDL would not interfere with any emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans, and no impacts would result from the project.
- g) The TMDL would not affect the potential for wildland fires. Therefore, no impacts from wildfires would result.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(iii) 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; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) TMDL implementation actions listed in Table 9-1 would not result in violations of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. This project is intended to improve water quality at the beaches and to attain applicable water quality standards.				
b-c) The candidate implementation actions would not affect groundwater supplies, substantially alter the existing drainage pattern, contribute additional runoff or interfere with the conveyance of urban storm water. Instead, actions to control bacteria loading will likely reduce the volume of stormwater, and of inflow and infiltration into stormwater and sewer collection systems, which will help to reduce flooding. The TMDL would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. No adverse impacts to groundwater would result. Actions to comply with the TMDL would not include large scale grading, construction on unpaved areas, vegetation removal, or stream course alteration and would not result in substantial erosion or siltation, either on- or off-site. The bacteria TMDL would not increase the rate or amount of runoff or exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems and no adverse impacts to channels would occur.				
d) Bacteria TMDL-related activities are intended to reduce bacteria at the beaches and improve water quality. No releases of bacteria would result, therefore, no adverse water quality impacts would occur.				
e) The TMDL implementation actions are part of the water quality control plan to reduce bacteria loads to the beaches. No conflict would occur.				

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>a) Implementation actions of the TMDL would include small-scale repairs and construction and would not result in physical dividing of any established community.</p> <p>b) The Bacteria TMDL is consistent with existing Local Coastal Program policies and goals and would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation. Many actions to comply with TMDL requirements would be either subject to regional or local agency review (e.g., replacement of septic systems) and therefore would not conflict with local land use plans or policies, and only less than significant impacts are expected.</p>				

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<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"/>
<p>a-b) The TMDL project is located in an area generally zoned for aggregate mineral resources, however, none of the reasonably foreseeable structural or non-structural compliance measures would be located in the areas where aggregate materials might be are extracted. Furthermore, the compliance measures should not preclude the mining of mineral resources in the future.</p>				

XIII. NOISE: Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a) Earthmoving and construction could temporarily generate noise. Projects that local agencies propose to comply with the TMDL would be required to comply with the local noise and nuisance standards and limited to the allocated construction hours from 7 am to 6 pm. Any increased noise levels would be temporary, and would cause less than significant impacts.
- b) To comply with the TMDL, specific projects could involve minor construction and the use of some heavy equipment, including pump trucks, which could result in temporary ground-borne vibration or noise. These activities would typically last no more than a few days and would be carried out in compliance with local standards. Therefore, the TMDL would not result in substantial noise, and noise impacts would be less-than-significant.
- c) There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project area. This condition precludes the possibility of the project creating aviation safety hazards for people residing or working in the area. The TMDL would not have the potential to create aviation safety hazards for people residing or working within two miles from the public airport and no additional impacts from airport noise exposure would result.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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 people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-b) The TMDL will not have any impact on housing and will not affect the population of the project area. It would not displace any existing housing or any people who would need replacement housing, and no adverse housing impacts would occur. It would not displace permanent residents or create a need for construction of replacement housing.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) The TMDL would not affect any governmental facilities or service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any public services, including fire protection, police protection, schools, or parks.

XVI. RECREATION: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>a) Projects to implement the TMDL could include minor excavation and grading to repair or replace sewer pipes; and installation of additional pet waste receptacles at the beaches and open space. Eventual compliance with bacteria targets might have the effect of encouraging more people to use the beaches at Pillar Point Harbor and Venice Beach. However, these beaches are already quite popular and heavily used, so incremental additional use of the beaches is not expected to cause physical deterioration of recreational facilities. No recreational facilities would need to be constructed or expanded and no recreational impacts would occur.</p> <p>b) The TMDL would not result in the need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities that could have an adverse effect on the environment.</p>				

XVII. TRANSPORTATION: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric 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"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>a-d) Because the TMDL would not increase population or provide employment, it would not generate any ongoing motor vehicle trips and would not affect level of service standards established by the county congestion management agency. Therefore, the TMDL would not result in permanent, substantial increases in traffic above existing conditions. Nor would the proposed action change any policy, plan, or program.</p>				

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES:

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

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

a-b) Implementation of the bacteria TMDL will not affect sites listed on the state or federal register of historic places. Any improvements to water quality conditions will take place at locations that that will have no effect on tribal cultural resources. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1, commonly referred to as AB 52, the Water Board checked whether any of the California Native American tribes requested a consultation in a project area and found no Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Half Moon Bay area who have requested the consultations. In addition, in an unlikely event that the ground disturbances uncover previously undiscovered or documented resources, California law protects Native American burials, skeletal remains, and associated grave goods regardless of the antiquity and provides for the sensitive treatment and disposition of those remains. (Health & Safety Code, section 7050.5; Public Resource Code, section 5097.9 et seq).

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

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

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental impacts? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- a) The project will not impose requirements to relocate or construct new wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. The TMDL could result in improvements to or expansion of the sewage collection system and/or wastewater treatment facilities to reduce sanitary sewer overflows or inflow and infiltration. Such activities would consist of relatively small construction projects that would be of short duration and would be implemented under existing permits. The TMDL implementation actions could also result in improvements to urban stormwater runoff systems, landfill discharges, and management of runoff from horse facilities to reduce bacteria discharges to Pillar Point Harbor and Venice Beach. These activities would also consist of small constructions and minor earth moving and would be of short duration. All actions will be implemented to improve water quality which will benefit the entire community and will result in only temporary less than significant impacts.
- b) Because the TMDL would not increase population or provide employment, it would not require ongoing additional water supply or entitlements.
- c) Because the TMDL addresses a pollution problem linked to the wastewater conveyance system, not the treatment plant itself, compliance would not require any increased wastewater treatment capacity or construction.
- d) TMDL implementation would not affect municipal solid waste generation or landfill capacities. No impacts would occur.
- e) TMDL implementation would not affect federal, state, and local statutes related to solid waste.

XX. WILDFIRE: If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

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

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

a-c) The implementation of the Bacteria TMDL would not impair any adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan and would not exacerbate wildfire risks. There will be no construction of roads, fuel breaks, power lines or other facilities or the road for transportation to the facilities. Therefore, the project would not result in alteration of the landscape or the surrounding areas that may start a wildfire.

- d) The TMDL would not require construction of any structures downslope or downstream of potential flooding or land slide areas. Therefore, the impacts would not occur.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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, substantially 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a) The TMDL would not degrade the quality of the environment. The proposed project is intended to restore and enhance water quality and to benefit the future of recreational uses in Pillar Point Harbor and Venice Beach.
- b) As discussed above, the TMDL could pose some less-than-significant adverse environmental impacts related to minor sewage system repair, replacement, and re-construction, and other small construction projects, such as stormwater management. These impacts from repair and construction activities would be individually limited and of short-term duration. When viewed with other projects with related impacts, the effects would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, these future projects would not lead to cumulatively considerable significant impacts. Moreover, the TMDL's monitoring provisions and the Water Board's adaptive management approach to implementation provide additional safeguards and guarantees that future implementation actions will be carried out in ways that enhance, and do not degrade, the quality of the environment at the beaches.
- c) The goal of the proposed TMDL and associated actions is to improve long term water quality by providing a program designed to protect and restore beneficial uses at the beaches in the TMDL project area. The TMDL will not adversely affect people, either directly or indirectly. To the contrary, achievement of water quality objectives is expected to reduce risk of gastrointestinal illness compared to current conditions, and to enhance aesthetic attributes and recreational opportunities at the beaches.

9.1.5 Potential Cumulative Impacts

This section provides an analysis of the significant cumulative impacts of the proposed Basin Plan amendment (CEQA Guidelines §15130). Cumulative impacts refer to "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts."

The cumulative impact that results from several related projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project combined with the impacts from other related past, present, and probable future projects.

As shown in the Environmental Checklist, the TMDL would not result in significant adverse impacts to the environment individually or cumulatively. This analysis considers past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects that could have similar environmental impacts, to determine that no significant cumulative impacts would occur. These include projects that would involve reduction of human waste discharges from various sewage handling systems, management of waste from confined animal facilities, and changes to urban stormwater infrastructure. This cumulative analysis considers projects in the area covered by the proposed Basin Plan amendment.

Any future Water Board regulations or enforcement actions would improve overall water quality in Pillar Point Harbor and Venice Beach and could include implementation actions that would further reduce bacteria at the beaches.

The cumulative impact of the TMDL with these other projects would be beneficial to the environment and would not result in cumulatively significant adverse environmental impacts. Our review of other planned, proposed, and ongoing projects reveals none that would lead to significant environmental impacts.

9.2 Consideration of Alternatives

As explained in this report, the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts on the environment and would not cause any reasonably foreseeable indirect physical changes. Therefore, based on the requirements of Cal. Code Regs., title 23, § 3777(e) and Cal. Code Regs., title 14, § 15252(a)(2)(B), no alternatives or mitigation measures are proposed.

An evaluation of the alternatives is required under CEQA Section 15252(a)(2)(A) to avoid or reduce any significant or potentially significant effects on the environment.