

# DRAFT

## AMENDMENT TO THE WATER QUALITY CONTROL PLAN FOR THE SACRAMENTO RIVER AND SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASINS TO DEDESIGNATE FOUR BENEFICIAL USES FOR OLD ALAMO CREEK, SOLANO COUNTY

### California Environmental Quality Act Requirements

As the Lead Agency for evaluating environmental impacts of changes to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins (Basin Plan), the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board) is responsible for reviewing proposed changes and complying with requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). (Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21000 et seq.) The Secretary of Resources has certified the planning process for Basin Plans as a regulatory program pursuant to PRC Section 21080.5 and CEQA Guidelines § 15251(g). This certification means basin planning is exempt from CEQA provisions that relate to preparing Environmental Impact Reports and Negative Declarations. This Functionally Equivalent Document (FED) satisfies the requirements of State Board Regulations for Implementation of CEQA, Exempt Regulatory Programs, which are found in the California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 27, Article 6, beginning with Section 3775.

### Proposed Project

The Basin Plan identifies beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives and includes an implementation plan to achieve the water quality objectives that protect beneficial uses. Basin Plan Table II-1 identifies beneficial uses for major water bodies in the Central Valley. When the Basin Plan does not specifically identify a water body's beneficial uses, Regional Board staff relies on the "tributary rule." The tributary rule on Basin Plan page II-2.00 states:

*"The beneficial uses of any specifically identified water body generally apply to its tributary streams. In some cases a beneficial use may not be applicable to the entire body of water. In these cases the Regional Water Board's judgement will be applied. It should be noted that it is impractical to list every surface water body in the Region. For unidentified water bodies, the beneficial uses will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis."*

The Regional Board also relies on its implementation of State Board Resolution 88-63, the "Sources of Drinking Water" Policy to identify some MUN uses. The Basin Plan states on page II-2.00:

*"Water Bodies within the basins that do not have beneficial uses designated in Table II-1 are assigned MUN designations in accordance with the provisions of State Water Board Resolution No. 88-63 which is, by reference, a part of this Basin Plan. These MUN designations in no way affect the presence or absence of other beneficial use designations in these water bodies."*

Old Alamo Creek is an ephemeral and highly modified stream in Solano County. Since it is not included in Table II-1, the creek's beneficial uses are assigned through the tributary rule and the

Regional Board's implementation of Resolution 88-63. The nearest downstream water for which the Basin Plan designates uses is Ulatis Creek, within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. The Basin Plan designates municipal and domestic supply (MUN), agricultural supply for irrigation and stock watering (AGR), industrial process supply (PRO), industrial service supply (IND), water contact recreation (REC-1), non-contact recreation (REC-2), warm freshwater habitat (WARM), cold freshwater habitat (COLD), migration of aquatic organisms (MIGR), spawning, reproduction and/or early development (SPWN), wildlife habitat (WILD) and navigation (NAV) for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. The Basin Plan defines these uses on pages II-1.00 and II-2.00.

The proposed Basin Plan amendment will dedesignate COLD, MIGR, MUN, and SPWN as beneficial uses for Old Alamo Creek because these uses are not existing or attainable.

### **Environmental Checklist**

**1. Project title:**

Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins to Dedesignate Four Beneficial Uses, COLD, MUN, MIGR and SPWN, for Old Alamo Creek, Solano County.

**2. Lead Agency Name and Address:**

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, 11020 Sun Center Drive, #200, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

**3. Contact Person and Phone Number:**

Elizabeth Thayer, Water Resource Control Engineer, (916) 464-4671  
Betty Yee, Senior Water Resource Control Engineer, (916) 464-4643

**4. Project Location:**

Old Alamo Creek, Solano County. From Nelson Park in Vacaville to confluence with New Alamo Creek near Elmira.

**5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, 11020 Sun Center Drive, #200, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

**6. Description of Project:**

Basin Plan amendment to dedesignate four beneficial uses, COLD, MUN, MIGR, AND SPWN, for Old Alamo Creek.

**7. Surrounding land uses and setting:**

Residential and agricultural.

**8. Other Public Agencies whose Approval is Required:**

State Water Resources Control Board  
Office of Administrative Law

United States Environmental Protection Agency

Alternative 1, no action: Under this option, the Regional Board will not amend the Basin Plan to dedesignate COLD, MUN, MIGR, or SPWN for Old Alamo Creek. These uses do not exist and cannot be feasibly attained in the future. Nevertheless, when writing discharge permits and making impairment assessments, Regional Board staff will be forced to recognize these uses and take actions to protect them. This may result in unnecessary treatment costs to protect non-existent uses.

Alternative 2: Adopt an amendment to the Basin Plan dedesignating COLD, MIGR, MUN, and SPWN beneficial uses because these uses are not existing or feasibly attainable.

**I. Background**

The baseline for this analysis is Old Alamo Creek’s condition, as it currently exists. The creek is disconnected from its headwaters and receives little natural flow. Downstream reaches are effluent dominated. COLD, MIGR, MUN and SPWN are not existing or feasibly attainable beneficial uses.

**II. Environmental Impacts**

The environmental factors checked below could be potentially affected by this project. See the checklist on the following pages for more details.

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning      | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation         | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing     | <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources               | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geological Problems /Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy and Mineral Resources       | <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                    |
| X Hydrology/Water Quality                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources      | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |  |

1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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"/>	X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

The proposed project will dedesignate four beneficial uses that do not exist and cannot feasibly be attained for Old Alamo Creek. The proposed action is not expected to impact aesthetics.

2. **AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental impacts, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. 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 pursuant to the Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

The proposed action is not expected to impact agricultural resources.

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

	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"/>	X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Beneficial use dedesignations are not expected to affect any of the endpoints this section describes.

4. 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 type="checkbox"/>	X
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally-protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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"/>	X
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"/>	X

An evaluation of Old Alamo Creek’s aquatic life uses by Tetra Tech, Inc. did not identify any rare, threatened or endangered species in the creek. A survey conducted for Vacaville as part of recent construction at the EWWTP identified several special status species with low and medium potential to be present in Old Alamo Creek. The study found the Giant garter snake (*Thamnophis couchi gigas*) and the Northwestern pond turtle (*Clemmys marmorata marmorata*) have low potential to inhabit Old Alamo Creek. It also found the California red-legged frog (*Rana aurora daytonii*) has medium potential to inhabit the creek. Riparian areas along Old Alamo Creek provide potential habitat for numerous species, particularly birds. (Vacaville, 1998. EIR Vol. II, pp. [4.6-7]-[4.6-14].) Since the beneficial use dedesignations considered for this project do not relate to riparian habitat, no impacts are expected.

The proposed action dedesignates COLD, MIGR and SPWN. COLD, MIGR and SPWN are not currently attained, nor are they feasibly attainable. Whether or not these uses are designated, there would be no discernable benefit to Old Alamo Creek’s biological resources. Pollutant concentrations and water column constituents do not limit attainability. Hydrologic modifications prevent COLD, MIGR and SPWN from being feasibly attainable. A lack of habitat and suitable substrate also limit the ability to attain COLD and SPWN. Since COLD, MIGR and SPWN are not existing or attainable, the current beneficial use designations for WARM and WILD will adequately protect Old Alamo Creek’s biological resources. The proposed action is not expected to impact any biological resources. Downstream waters with COLD, MIGR, SPWN uses will remain fully protected.

5. 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 as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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"/>	X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

See discussion under AIR QUALITY.

6. 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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated in the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines & Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternate wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

See discussion under AIR QUALITY.

7. 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"/>	X
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"/>	X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

See discussion under AIR QUALITY.

8. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or volume of surface runoff in a manner that would:				

i) result in flooding on- or off-site	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
ii) create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater discharge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
iii) provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
iv) result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Place housing or other structures which would impede or re-direct flood flows within a 100-yr. flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Would the change in the water volume and/or the pattern of seasonal flows in the affected watercourse result in:				
i) a significant cumulative reduction in the water supply downstream of the diversion?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
ii) a significant reduction in water supply, either on an annual or seasonal basis, to senior water right holders downstream of the diversion?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
iii) a significant reduction in the available aquatic habitat or riparian habitat for native species of plants and animals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
iv) a significant change in seasonal water temperatures due to changes in the patterns of water flow in the stream?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
v) a substantial increase or threat from invasive, non-native plants and wildlife	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
g) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
i) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

The proposed action will not cause a violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. It will not affect groundwater recharge or drainage patterns, the location of structures, flow quantity or patterns in Old Alamo Creek, or flood risks.

The proposed action will not degrade water quality. COLD, MIGR, MUN, and SPWN are not existing or feasibly attainable beneficial uses for Old Alamo Creek, and there is no evidence they were since November 28, 1975. Federal criteria and state objectives to protect COLD, MIGR, MUN, and SPWN designated waters will have to be met at the nearest point downstream where these uses apply. Meeting criteria or objectives to protect these uses in Old Alamo Creek would have minimal benefit since these uses are not existing or feasibly attainable for reasons other than water quality. Table 1 provides a list of the criteria and objectives that are affected by the presence or absence of COLD, MIGR, MUN and SPWN designations. Not recognizing COLD, MIGR and SPWN only affects the dissolved oxygen objective. Waters with COLD, MIGR and SPWN designations are required to have a minimum dissolved oxygen concentration of 7.0 mg/L. Waters with WARM, a current beneficial use designation for Old Alamo Creek, must

have a minimum dissolved oxygen concentration of 5.0 mg/L. Federal criteria and state objectives for priority toxic pollutants protect COLD, MIGR, SPWN and WARM equally. That is, the two main sources of numeric, pollutant-specific criteria and objectives, the Basin Plan and the California Toxics Rule (CTR), do not distinguish between aquatic life uses. Retaining WARM but not COLD, MIGR or SPWN will not have any impact on most criteria and objectives. Not including MUN in Old Alamo Creek’s designated uses will eliminate the need to meet many criteria and objectives. Since MUN is not an existing or attainable use because of Old Alamo Creek’s low natural flows, pollutant concentrations do not place a significant limitation on attainability. Further, there are significant safeguards to prevent water quality degradation in Old Alamo Creek. Any permitted discharge to the creek must comply with federal antibacksliding and antidegradation proscriptions and must ensure that downstream water quality standards are met.

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

See discussion under AIR QUALITY.

10. 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 future value to the region and the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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"/>	X

See discussion under AIR QUALITY.

11. NOISE. Would the project result in:

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

a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing in or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing in or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

See discussion under AIR QUALITY.

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area either directly ( <i>e.g.</i> , by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly ( <i>e.g.</i> , through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

See discussion under AIR QUALITY.

13. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service rations, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- |                             |                          |                          |                          |   |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| d) Parks?                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| e) Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

See discussion under AIR QUALITY.

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

The proposed amendment will not have any impact on the endpoints described in this section.

15. TRANSPORTATION / CIRCULATION. Would the project:

- |   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system ( <i>i.e.</i> , result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                           | <input type="checkbox"/>     | X         |
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level-of-service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                           | <input type="checkbox"/>     | X         |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                           | <input type="checkbox"/>     | X         |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature ( <i>e.g.</i> , sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses ( <i>e.g.</i> , farm equipment)?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                           | <input type="checkbox"/>     | X         |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                           | <input type="checkbox"/>     | X         |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                           | <input type="checkbox"/>     | X         |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation ( <i>e.g.</i> , bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                           | <input type="checkbox"/>     | X         |

See discussion under AIR QUALITY.

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

The proposed project is not expected to impact any of the endpoints described in this section.

17. 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, 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"/>	X
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 type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

a): The proposed project will not degrade the quality of the environment, reduce habitat or impact rare, threatened or endangered species. See the discussion on species of special concern under “BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES”.

b): The proposed amendment is not expected to cause “cumulatively considerable” impacts in conjunction with any past or current projects. Old Alamo Creek’s hydrologic modifications led to conditions that preclude COLD, MIGR, MUN and SPWN. COLD and SPWN are primarily limited by naturally occurring physical conditions and MUN is limited by low flows. MIGR is precluded by hydrologic modifications and the lack of suitable habitat that would be the destination of migrating species. In terms of possible future projects, Vacaville is conducting studies to examine beneficial uses of downstream waters to which Old Alamo Creek is tributary including New Alamo Creek, Ulatis Creek and Cache Slough. If any uses are existing or feasibly attainable, they will have to be fully protected. Regardless of what uses are designated for Old Alamo Creek, all downstream uses will have to be protected.

c): MUN is the only use anticipated to have any direct or indirect impact on humans. Not including MUN among Old Alamo Creek’s beneficial uses is not expected to cause substantial adverse effects on humans directly or indirectly. Investigations of Old Alamo Creek’s uses did not find any evidence that anyone has, does or will rely on Old Alamo Creek as a municipal or domestic supply. These investigations also found that it is not feasible to attain MUN because of low flows. In terms of aquatic life beneficial uses, acknowledging that COLD, MIGR and SPWN are not among Old Alamo Creek’s existing or attainable uses is not expected to impact humans directly or indirectly. Criteria and objectives that protect human health from ingesting contaminated aquatic life would still be enforceable under the WARM use.

COLD, MIGR, MUN, and SPWN are not existing uses and are not feasibly attainable for Old Alamo Creek. If the proposed project is approved, criteria and objectives that protect Old Alamo Creek’s other uses, including AGR, PRO, IND, REC-1, REC-2, WARM, WILD and NAV, will apply to Old Alamo Creek. These include numeric priority pollutant criteria to protect aquatic life, bacterial objectives to protect recreation and narrative objectives that ensure water quality is not adversely impacted by chemical constituents, biostimulatory substances or other pollutants. Criteria and objectives that protect human health from the impacts of consuming contaminated fish and shellfish will also apply. Criteria and objectives that protect COLD, MIGR, MUN, and SPWN will not apply to Old Alamo Creek although they will apply at the nearest downstream water where these uses are designated.

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this evaluation I find that the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment.

Thomas Pinkos, Executive Officer	Date
Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region	

-----

-----

**Authority:** Public Resources Code Sections 21083, 21084, 21084.1, and 21087.

**Reference:** Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.1 through 21083.3, 21083.6 through 21083.9, 21084.1, 21093, 21094, 21151; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino*, 202 Cal. App. 3d 296 (1988); *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors*, 222 Cal. App. 3d 1337 (1990).

**Table 1:** Allowable water constituents and pollutant concentrations as determined by the presence or absence of COLD, MIGR, SPWN and MUN beneficial uses. Only those pollutants affected by the presence or absence of these uses are presented.

Pollutant /parameter	COLD present	COLD absent	MIGR present	MIGR absent	SPWN present	SPWN absent	MUN present ( $\mu\text{g/L}^1$ )	MUN absent ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )
Dissolved oxygen	7.0 mg/L <sup>1,3</sup>	5.0 mg/L <sup>3</sup>	7.0 mg/L <sup>3</sup>	5.0 mg/L <sup>3</sup>	7.0 mg/L <sup>3</sup>	5.0 mg/L <sup>3</sup>	NA <sup>2</sup>	NA
<b>INORGANICS</b>								
Antimony							6 <sup>4</sup>	4,300 <sup>5</sup>
Arsenic							50 <sup>4</sup>	150 <sup>5</sup>
Asbestos							7,000,000 fibers/L <sup>4,5</sup>	NA
Barium							1000 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Beryllium							4 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Chromium							50 <sup>4</sup> (Cr III and VI)	180 <sup>5</sup> (Cr III) 11 <sup>5</sup> (Cr VI)
Iron							300 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Manganese							50 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Mercury							0.050 <sup>5</sup>	0.051 <sup>5</sup>
Nitrate (as NO <sub>3</sub> )							45000 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Nitrate + nitrite (as N)							10000 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Nitrite							1000 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Thallium							1.7 <sup>5</sup>	6.3 <sup>5</sup>
<b>VOLATILES</b>								
Acrolein							320 <sup>5</sup>	780 <sup>5</sup>
Acrylonitrile							0.059 <sup>5</sup>	0.66 <sup>5</sup>
Benzene							1.2 <sup>5</sup>	71 <sup>5</sup>
Bromoform							4.3 <sup>5</sup>	360 <sup>5</sup>
Carbon tetrachloride							0.25 <sup>5</sup>	4.4 <sup>5</sup>
Chlorobenzene							70 <sup>4</sup>	21,000 <sup>5</sup>
Chlorodibromomethane							0.41 <sup>5</sup>	34 <sup>5</sup>
2-Chlorophenol							120 <sup>5</sup>	400 <sup>5</sup>
Dichlorobromomethane							0.56 <sup>5</sup>	46 <sup>5</sup>

**Table 1:** Continued

<b>Pollutant /parameter</b>	<b>COLD present</b>	<b>COLD absent</b>	<b>MIGR present</b>	<b>MIGR absent</b>	<b>SPWN present</b>	<b>SPWN absent</b>	<b>MUN present (µg/L<sup>1</sup>)</b>	<b>MUN absent (µg/L)</b>
1,1-Dichloroethane							5 <sup>4</sup>	NA
1,2-Dichloroethane							0.38 <sup>5</sup>	99 <sup>5</sup>
1,1-Dichloroethylene							0.057 <sup>5</sup>	3.2 <sup>5</sup>
cis-1,2-Dichloroethylene							6 <sup>4</sup>	NA
trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene							10 <sup>4</sup>	140,000 <sup>5</sup>
2,4-Dichlorophenol							93 <sup>5</sup>	790 <sup>5</sup>
1,2-Dichloropropane							0.52 <sup>5</sup>	39 <sup>5</sup>
1,3-Dichloropropylene							10 <sup>5</sup>	1,700 <sup>5</sup>
2,4-Dimethylphenol							540 <sup>5</sup>	2,300 <sup>5</sup>
2,4-Dinitrophenol							70 <sup>5</sup>	14,000 <sup>5</sup>
Ethylbenzene							300 <sup>4</sup>	29,000 <sup>5</sup>
2-Methyl-4,6-dinitrophenol							13.4 <sup>5</sup>	765 <sup>5</sup>
Methylene chloride							4.7 <sup>5</sup>	1,600 <sup>5</sup>
Phenol							21,000 <sup>5</sup>	4,600,000 <sup>5</sup>
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethylene							0.17 <sup>5</sup>	11 <sup>5</sup>
Tetrachloroethylene							0.8 <sup>5</sup>	8.85 <sup>5</sup>
Toluene							150 <sup>4</sup>	200,000 <sup>5</sup>
1,1,2-Trichloroethane							0.60 <sup>5</sup>	42 <sup>5</sup>
Trichloroethylene							2.7 <sup>5</sup>	81 <sup>5</sup>
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol							2.1 <sup>5</sup>	6.5 <sup>5</sup>
Vinyl chloride							0.5 <sup>4</sup>	525 <sup>5</sup>
Xylenes							1750 <sup>4</sup>	NA
1,1,1-Trichloroethane							200 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Trichlorofluormethane							150 <sup>4</sup>	NA
1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane							1200 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Styrene							100 <sup>4</sup>	NA
<b>SEMI-VOLATILES</b>								
Acenaphthene							1,200 <sup>5</sup>	2,700 <sup>5</sup>

**Table 1:** Continued

<b>Pollutant /parameter</b>	<b>COLD present</b>	<b>COLD absent</b>	<b>MIGR present</b>	<b>MIGR absent</b>	<b>SPWN present</b>	<b>SPWN absent</b>	<b>MUN present (<math>\mu\text{g/L}^1</math>)</b>	<b>MUN absent (<math>\mu\text{g/L}</math>)</b>
Anthracene							9,600 <sup>5</sup>	110,000 <sup>5</sup>
Benzidene							0.00012 <sup>5</sup>	0.00054 <sup>5</sup>
Benzo(a)anthracene							0.0044 <sup>5</sup>	0.049 <sup>5</sup>
Benzo(a)pyrene							0.0044 <sup>5</sup>	0.049 <sup>5</sup>
Benzo(b)fluoranthene							0.0044 <sup>5</sup>	0.049 <sup>5</sup>
Benzo(k)fluoranthene							0.0044 <sup>5</sup>	0.049 <sup>5</sup>
Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether							0.031 <sup>5</sup>	1.4 <sup>5</sup>
Bis(2-chloro-isopropyl)ether							1400 <sup>5</sup>	170,000 <sup>5</sup>
Bis(2-ethyl-hexyl)phthalate							1.8 <sup>5</sup>	5.9 <sup>5</sup>
Butylbenzyl phthalate							3000 <sup>5</sup>	5,200 <sup>5</sup>
2-Chloronaphthalene							1700 <sup>5</sup>	4,300 <sup>5</sup>
Chrysene							0.0044 <sup>5</sup>	0.049 <sup>5</sup>
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene							0.0044 <sup>5</sup>	0.049 <sup>5</sup>
1,2 Dichlorobenzene							600 <sup>4</sup>	17,000 <sup>5</sup>
1,3 Dichlorobenzene							400 <sup>5</sup>	2,600 <sup>5</sup>
1,4 Dichlorobenzene							5 <sup>4</sup>	2,600 <sup>5</sup>
3,3' Dichlorobenzidene							0.04 <sup>5</sup>	0.077 <sup>5</sup>
Di(2-ethylhexyl) adipate							400 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Diethyl phthalate							23,000 <sup>5</sup>	120,000 <sup>5</sup>
Dimethyl phthalate							313,000 <sup>5</sup>	2,900,000 <sup>5</sup>
Di-n-butyl phthalate							2,700 <sup>5</sup>	12,000 <sup>5</sup>
2,4-Dinitrotoluene							0.11 <sup>5</sup>	9.1 <sup>5</sup>
1,2-Diphenylhydrazine							0.040 <sup>5</sup>	0.54 <sup>5</sup>
Fluoranthene							300 <sup>5</sup>	370 <sup>5</sup>
Fluorene							1,300 <sup>5</sup>	14,000 <sup>5</sup>
Hexachlorobenzene							0.00075 <sup>5</sup>	0.00077 <sup>5</sup>
Hexachlorobutadiene							0.44 <sup>5</sup>	50 <sup>5</sup>
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene							50 <sup>4</sup>	17,000 <sup>5</sup>
Hexachloroethane							1.9 <sup>5</sup>	8.9 <sup>5</sup>

**Table 1:** Continued

Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene							0.0044 <sup>5</sup>	0.049 <sup>5</sup>
<b>Pollutant /parameter</b>	<b>COLD present</b>	<b>COLD absent</b>	<b>MIGR present</b>	<b>MIGR absent</b>	<b>SPWN present</b>	<b>SPWN absent</b>	<b>MUN present (µg/L<sup>1</sup>)</b>	<b>MUN absent (µg/L)</b>
Isophorone							8.4 <sup>5</sup>	600 <sup>5</sup>
Nitrobenzene							17 <sup>5</sup>	1,900 <sup>5</sup>
N-nitrosodimethyl- amine							0.00069 <sup>5</sup>	8.1 <sup>5</sup>
N-nitrosodi-n-propylamine							0.005 <sup>5</sup>	1.4 <sup>5</sup>
N-nitrosodiphenyl-amine							5.0 <sup>5</sup>	16 <sup>5</sup>
Pyrene							960 <sup>5</sup>	11,000 <sup>5</sup>
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene							5 <sup>4</sup>	NA
2,3,7,8-TCDD (dioxin)							0.000000013 <sup>5</sup>	0.000000014 <sup>5</sup>
<b>PESTICIDES<sup>6</sup></b>								
Alachlor							2 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Atrazine							1 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Bentazon							18 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Carbofuran							18 <sup>4</sup>	NA
2,4-Dichlorophenoxy-acetic acid							70 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Dalapon							200 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Dibromochloropropane							0.2 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Dinoseb							7 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Diquat							20 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Endothall							100 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Ethylene dibromide							0.05 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Glyphosate							700 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Methyl bromide							48 <sup>5</sup>	4,000 <sup>5</sup>
Molinate							20 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Oxamyl							50 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Pentachlorophenol							0.28 <sup>5</sup>	8.2 <sup>5</sup>
Picloram							500 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Simazine							4 <sup>4</sup>	NA
Thiobencarb							1 <sup>3</sup>	NA

**Table 1:** Continued

2,4,5-Trichloro-phenoxyacetic acid							50 <sup>4</sup>	NA
<b>Pollutant /parameter</b>	<b>COLD present</b>	<b>COLD absent</b>	<b>MIGR present</b>	<b>MIGR absent</b>	<b>SPWN present</b>	<b>SPWN absent</b>	<b>MUN present (µg/L<sup>1</sup>)</b>	<b>MUN absent (µg/L)</b>
<b>RADIONUCLIDES</b>								
Combined Radium-226 and Radium-228							5 pCi/L <sup>7,4</sup>	NA
Gross Alpha particle activity (including Radium-226 but excluding Radon and Uranium)							15 pCi/L <sup>4</sup>	NA
Tritium							20,000 pCi/L <sup>4</sup>	NA
Strontium-90							8 pCi/L <sup>4</sup>	NA
Gross Beta particle activity							50 pCi/L <sup>4</sup>	NA
Uranium							20 pCi/L <sup>4</sup>	NA

Footnotes

- 1: mg/L-milligrams per liter, µg/L micrograms per liter.
- 2: NA-not applicable. No federal criteria or state objectives exist for this pollutant or parameter in the presence/absence of a given use. Narrative objectives from the Basin Plan may be applied to control these pollutants in some situations.
- 3: Basin Plan, chapter III.
- 4: Department of Health Services maximum contaminant level taken from Basin Plan Chapter III.
- 5: California Toxics Rule at 40 CFR 131.38.
- 6: Central Valley Basin Plan contains a requirement that total identifiable persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides not be present at detectable concentrations. Basin Plan p. [III-6.00]. This includes aldrin, dieldrin, α-BHC, β-BHC, γ-BHC, δ-BHC, chlordane, 4,4'-DDD, 4,4'-DDE, 4,4'-DDT, endosulfan I, endosulfan II, endosulfan sulfate, endrin, endrin aldehyde, endrin ketone, heptachlor, heptachlor epoxide, methoxychlor and toxaphene.
- 7: pCi/L-picocuries per liter.

The Basin Plan contains narrative requirements that pollutants not be present at concentrations that harm beneficial uses. In some cases, narrative objectives may allow a more stringent criterion or objective than those listed here.