



**SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY UNIFIED AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT
INITIAL STUDY/ Proposed Negative Declaration**

2007 Ozone Plan

Public Review Period Begins: February 21, 2007
Public Review Period Ends: March 23, 2007 at 5:00 P.M.

A. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Project Title:

2007 Ozone Plan

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District
1990 E. Gettysburg Avenue
Fresno CA 93726-0244

3. Contact Person:

Ms. Jessica Hafer
Air Quality Specialist
(559) 230-5800

4. Project Location:

The *2007 Ozone Plan* applies to emission sources (primarily emission sources of volatile organic compounds and nitrogen oxides) located within the boundaries of the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (see Exhibit 1, Map of Basin Boundaries).

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District
1990 E. Gettysburg Avenue
Fresno CA 93726-0244

6. Project Description

A. Background

The *2007 Ozone Plan* presents the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's (District) strategy for achieving the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for 8-hour ozone.



Exhibit 1
San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District Boundaries





When approved by the California Air Resources Board, the 2007 ozone Plan is the State Implementation Plan (SIP) amendment required by the federal Clean Air Act (CAA) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) *Final Rule to Implement the 8-hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard* (69 FR 23951-24000, 71 FR 61144-61233).

In addition to meeting the requirements of the CAA and containing measures needed to attain the NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable, this SIP includes the latest technical information, including emissions inventory, monitoring data, and computer modeling results. The Plan is divided into several chapters, with supporting documents provided as appendices.

The District and the California Air Resources Board (ARB) began the SJV 8-hour ozone planning process with a community meeting in January 2005. A series of Town Hall Meetings in July 2006 outlined 8-hour ozone progress and challenges and invited the public to submit ideas for reducing ozone air pollution in the SJV. The District released the first draft of the ozone plan on October 3, 2006 and released the second draft on October 17, 2006 in conjunction with a workshop on the plan. The District released the final Draft *2007 Ozone Plan* on January 29, 2007 and held a workshop on February 8, 2007. The *2007 Ozone Plan* is due to EPA by June 15, 2007 and must be submitted through the ARB.

Following receipt of a Plan, the EPA must find the Plan complete within six months of receipt. The EPA must act on the plan within one year of finding the Plan complete (CAA Section 110k).

B. Plan Description

The *2007 Ozone Plan* is divided into several chapters and appendices. These chapters are briefly summarized below:

Executive Summary

This presents the twelve guiding principles used in formulating and implementing this plan, the plan goals and purposes, the challenges, and the District's overall strategy.

Chapter 1 Progress and Current Air Quality

This chapter presents an overview of the progress that has been made and the current state of the San Joaquin Valley's air quality. This chapter includes brief discussions of ambient air quality data and emissions inventory data.

Chapter 2 Meeting Federal Requirements

This chapter describes some of the health effects of ozone, EPA's process for setting health-based standards, and how regions like the San Joaquin Valley work towards attaining those standards.



Chapter 3 What is Needed to Demonstrate Attainment?

This chapter describes what is needed to demonstrate that the San Joaquin Valley can attain the federal air quality standards for 8-hour ozone by the statutory attainment date. To aid in the understanding of the scope of this effort, this chapter includes discussion of the local challenges (such as natural conditions, population growth, and jurisdictional limitations). Computer modeling is used to determine the quantity of emissions reductions that the District will need to demonstrate attainment of the standards.

Chapter 4 Strategy

This chapter discusses the District's overall strategy for achieving emissions reductions and bringing the San Joaquin Valley into attainment of the federal 8-hour ozone standard. The District's four-faceted control strategy will help achieve the maximum reductions in the most expeditious manner possible.

Chapter 5 Public Accountability

To ensure accountability to the public, the District will complete annual reports to show progress in fulfilling its ozone and particulate matter plan commitments. These reports will be made publicly available and will be presented to the Governing Board in April of each year, beginning in 2008.

Chapter 6 District Regulatory Control Measures for Stationary Sources

This chapter describes one of the District's three responsibilities under the four-faceted strategy, including the control measures the District plans to adopt as well as a schedule for adoption and the expected reductions to be achieved by these control measures. Rules will require equipment changes, and will go through additional CEQA reviews.

Chapter 7 Action Plan for Reducing Emissions with Incentive Funds

Through incentives, funding is provided for projects that achieve emission reductions to supplement those from rules and regulations. Incentives allow the District to reduce emissions from source categories outside of the District's regulatory authority, as well as source categories where financial hardship would otherwise prevent traditional control strategies being implemented. This plan calls for a significant increase in incentives to bring a large segment of the SJV population into attainment earlier than otherwise possible. This chapter provides a detailed action plan for securing and expending the proposed incentive funds. Because the District will depend heavily on incentive-based reductions to meet federal CAA requirements in this and future air quality plans, the District is working with EPA to identify ways to ensure that emissions reductions from incentive programs can be used in air quality plans to meet CAA requirements.

Chapter 8 Innovative Strategies and Programs

Recognizing that every sector (including the general public) must reduce emissions, this chapter presents District proposals for innovative strategies and programs that will



involve wide-ranging public and private participation. The District's implementation of these programs will lead to greater public awareness of air quality problems and increased public participation towards air pollution solutions.

Chapter 9 Local, State, and Federal Controls

This chapter presents controls submitted to the District from local, state, and federal agencies for inclusion in the SIP.

Chapter 10 Reasonable Further Progress

This chapter explains and demonstrates reasonable further progress (RFP) and quantitative milestones that are required until the SJVAB reaches attainment of the federal 8-hour ozone air quality standard. The data in this chapter is based on information that has been provided in other chapters and appendices of this plan.

Chapter 11 Conclusion

The District is proposing an innovative and exhaustive control strategy in this plan, and the reductions achieved by these programs will result in continuous air quality improvements throughout the Valley. This chapter discusses the attainment year and classifications as well as new permitting requirements and the District's approach for contingency measures.

Appendices

The *2007 Ozone Plan* makes reference to the following appendices:

Appendix A: Ambient Air Quality Data

Appendix B: Emissions Inventory

Appendix C: Conformity Budgets

Appendix D: Emission Reduction Credits

Appendix E: Triennial Progress Report for the California 1-hour Ozone Standard

Appendix F: Photochemical Modeling

Appendix G: Town Hall Meeting Suggestions

Appendix H: Screening Analysis

Appendix I: Candidate Control Measures

Appendix J: Strategic Action Plan for the California Partnership for the SJV

Appendix K: Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) Analysis for Wine Fermentation, Wine Storage, and Brandy Aging

Appendix L: Comments and Responses on the October 2006 Drafts of the Plan

7. Other Agencies Whose Approvals Are Required and Permits Needed:

The District has discretionary authority to implement the District control measures, incentives, and other District options identified in the *Plan*. It does not have authority to approve or implement the State of California measures identified in the *Plan*, nor does



the District have land use authority to implement measures identified by local governments in the *Plan*. The California Air Resources Board must approve this plan and then officially transmit it to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). EPA's final rule approving the plan would place it in to the SIP.

8. Project Compatibility with Existing Zones and Plans:

Not applicable to this project.

9. Name of Person Who Prepared Initial Study:

Jessica Hafer
Air Quality Specialist



B. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by the proposed project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated", as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| ☐ Aesthetics | ☐ Agriculture Resources | ☐ Air Quality |
| ☐ Biological Resources | ☐ Cultural Resources | ☐ Geology/Soils |
| ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials | ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality | ☐ Land Use/Planning |
| ☐ Mineral Resources | ☐ Noise | ☐ Population/Housing |
| ☐ Public Services | ☐ Recreation | ☐ Transportation/Traffic |
| ☐ Utilities/Service Systems | ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

C. DETERMINATION

I certify that this project was independently reviewed and analyzed and that this document reflects the independent judgment of the District.

- ☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

Signature:  Date: 2/20/07

Printed name: Seyed Sadredin
Title: Executive Director/Air Pollution Control Officer



D. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CHECKLIST

Explanations of all answers on the check-off list are located in Section E.

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			√
			√
			√
			√
			√
			√
			√



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

Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓



to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

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

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			√
			√
			√
			√
			√
			√
			√
			√



	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				√
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				√
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				√
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				√



	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				√
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				√
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				√
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				√
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				√
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				√
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				√



	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				√
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				√
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				√
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				√
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				√
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				√
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				√
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				√
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				√
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				√
				√



c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			√
			√
			√
			√
			√
			√
			√
			√



a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

Fire protection?

Police protection?

Schools?

Parks?

Other public facilities?

XIV. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			√
			√
			√
			√
			√
			√
			√
			√
			√



XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC --

Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?
- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?
- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?
- f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?
- g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

-- Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓



	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				√
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				√
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				√
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				√
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				√
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				√
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				√
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				√



E. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CHECKLIST COMMENTS

I. AESTHETICS

Because the Plan's control measures primarily affect industrial, institutional, or commercial facilities located in appropriately zoned areas that are not usually associated with scenic resources, adoption of the Plan would not require any changes in the physical environment that would obstruct any scenic vistas or views of interest to the public. The Plan would not create aesthetically offensive sites visible to the public. No significant adverse aesthetic or recreation impacts are expected from the Plan. The *2007 Ozone Plan* may have a beneficial effect on scenic resources by improving visibility as well as improving air quality.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

Control measures in the *2007 Ozone Plan* that are directly linked to agriculture include Open Burn (S-AGR-1) and CAFO (S-AGR-2). Neither will result in substantive conversion of prime or unique farmland to non-agricultural use. Composting Biosolids (S-Gov-1) and Composting Green Waste (S-Gov-5) may also impact agricultural practices; however, these put controls on these existing operations. The plan will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contract. Ozone levels are expected to be lowered over the life of the plan and could provide benefits to agricultural resources by reducing the adverse impacts of ozone on plants and animals.

III. AIR QUALITY

Based on analysis of the reasonably foreseeable control measures included in the Plan, the Plan will not violate any air quality standards or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. The purpose of the *2007 Ozone Plan* is to move the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin toward attainment of the federal and state ambient air quality standards for ozone through control strategy implementation. Although the focus of this plan is not exceedances of the federal and state ambient air quality standards for PM_{2.5}, it is expected that the control strategy presented in the *2007 Ozone Plan* will improve the PM_{2.5} air quality as well. Hazardous risk assessments and other analyses are completed as needed as individual rules are developed and adopted. No alteration of air movement, moisture, temperature, climate change, or creation of objectionable odors will result from adoption of the Plan.

III. e): Although in some cases reformulated products have some odors, it is typically the case that reformulated products have less noticeable odors than the products they are replacing. As a result, significant adverse odor impacts have not been associated with reformulated products compared to conventional high-VOC products. Further, owners/operators of industries affected by control measures in the proposed *2007*



Ozone Plan would still be subject to existing air quality rules and regulations, which prohibits creating odor nuisances. In addition, the *2007 Ozone Plan* will control additional VOC emissions (e.g., additional oil and gas, and refinery and chemical fugitives, and composting regulations) reducing the potential for odors from certain sources. For these reasons, implementing the *2007 Ozone Plan* is not anticipated to create significant adverse odor impacts.

AB32, the Global Warming Bill, requires ARB to establish a statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions limit equivalent to the 1990 statewide GHG emissions levels, to be achieved by 2020. After establishing this limit by January 1, 2008, ARB will then adopt rules and regulations to achieve the necessary reductions. At this time, there is no accepted threshold of significance relative to global warming under CEQA.

The *2007 Ozone Plan* reduces ozone levels, and ozone is a greenhouse gas (GHG). This plan could have a beneficial effect on GHG levels and climate change. In addition, some measures in the *Plan* could increase emissions of other GHGs, and others could decrease GHG emissions. Control measures like Open Burning (S-AGR-1) and Employer-Based Trip Reduction (M-TRAN-1) will decrease GHG emissions. However, Solvents (S-SOL-11) and Architectural Coatings (S-SOL-1) have the potential to slightly increase GHG emissions. It is difficult to quantify the net impact in the planning stage since the rulemaking process will identify the control options that will be used to meet the target of each control measure. The details resulting from the rulemaking process would determine the overall GHG and potential climate impact. In addition, the state has not yet developed baseline emissions inventories nor has it specified thresholds of significance for GHGs. Absence of this information makes any assessment remote and speculative, which would not reflect reasonably foreseeable impacts that are required to be addressed under CEQA. Since ozone formation depends on temperature, climate change could also affect future ozone levels in the SJVAB.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Adoption of the Plan is not expected to adversely affect existing plant or animal species or communities, unique or endangered plant or animal species, or agricultural crops. No additional significant adverse impacts to biological resources will be affected because biological resources are already disturbed on existing sites and areas where the Plan will be implemented. Further, improvements in air quality from the Plan are expected to provide health benefits to plant and animal species, as well as to humans in the San Joaquin Valley.

IV. a), b), d): As of January 1, 2007, the Fish and Game environmental document fees increased, and the “de minimis” effect exemption were replaced with a “no impact to wildlife” exemption. The effect of implementing the *2007 Ozone Plan* control measures is primarily in modifications at existing commercial or industrial facilities to control or further control emissions. Such existing commercial or industrial facilities are generally



located in appropriately zoned commercial or industrial areas, which typically do not support candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Similarly, modifications at existing facilities would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with native or resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Further, since the *2007 Ozone Plan* primarily regulates stationary emission sources at existing commercial or industrial facilities, it does not directly or indirectly affect land use policy that may adversely affect riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or identified by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Given these considerations, the *2007 Ozone Plan* will have no effect on fish or wildlife.

The *2007 Ozone Plan* includes Control Measure S-AGR-1 – Open Burning that would phase out open burning between 2005 and 2010, pursuant to Health and Safety Code §41855.5(a). Additional language was included in the Health and Safety Code requirements that require the District to develop a rule to regulate limited open burning for disposal of diseased crops and weed control. Therefore, the control measures would still allow for limited open burning of diseased crops and weed control, minimizing the potential impacts associated with the spread of disease within crops and other vegetation.

Several control measures would control emissions from agricultural operations, or control emissions from engines or gasoline storage and dispensing facilities located at agricultural operations, requiring additional control equipment, new equipment, or revised operations. These control measures may change certain operating conditions at these facilities but would not require the closure of these facilities, thus, potentially changing the land use and resulting in the elimination of agricultural or other biological resources.

IV. c, e, f): The proposed project would not affect land use policies or designations. For these reasons, the proposed project would not adversely affect protected wetlands as defined by §404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc., through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means. Implementing the proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* is not anticipated to affect land use plans, local policies or ordinances, or regulations protecting biological resources such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. The innovative control measure on Heat Island Mitigation (Section 8.2.4) could enhance tree planting in the Valley as a way to reduce urban temperatures. Similarly, the proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* would not affect in any way habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans, agricultural resources or operations, and would not create divisions in any existing communities.



V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Implementing the proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* is primarily anticipated to result in controlling stationary source emissions at existing commercial or industrial facilities and establishing emission standards for mobile sources. Affected facilities are typically located in appropriately zoned commercial or industrial areas that have previously been disturbed. Any effects from implementing the strategies contain in the Plan will occur at existing sites and areas. As a result, significant impacts to cultural resources are not expected by the Plan because it will not require the destruction of existing buildings or sites with prehistoric, historic, archaeological, religious, or ethnic significance. Adoption of the Plan is not anticipated to result in any activities or promote any programs that could have a significant adverse impact on cultural resources within the District.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

There are no provisions in the Plan that would call for the disruption or over-covering of soil, changes in topography or surface relief features, the erosion of beach sand, or a change in existing siltation rates. Agricultural-related control measures like CAFO (S-AGR-2) are not expected to disrupt soil or topography with requirements for new practices. Any facilities affected by the control measures included in this plan would also be required to comply with relevant Uniform Building Code (a standard safeguard against major structural failures and loss of life) requirements in effect at the time of initial construction or modification of a structure. The local cities or counties are responsible for assuring that projects comply with the Uniform Building Code as part of the issuance of the building permits and can conduct inspections to ensure compliance. The District does not have land use authority (California Health and Safety Code, Sec. 40716(b)), so the District is generally prohibited from encouraging or probating specific land uses in specific locations in the Valley. As such, adoption of the Plan will not increase the exposure of people or property to geologic hazards, fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, seismic ground failure, seiche, tsunami or volcanic hazard.

VI. b): Although the proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* control measures may require modifications at existing industrial or commercial facilities, such modifications are not anticipated to require substantial grading or construction activities. Similarly, the proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* does not include control measures that require paving to reduce fugitive dust emissions from dirt roads or unpaved parking areas. The proposed project does not have the potential to substantially increase the area subject to compaction or overcovering since the subject areas would be limited in size and, typically, have already been graded or displaced in some way. Therefore, significant adverse soil erosion impacts are not anticipated from implementing the *Plan*.

VI. e) Septic tanks or other similar alternative wastewater disposal systems are typically associated with small residential projects in remote areas. The proposed *2007*



Ozone Plan does not contain any control measures that would trigger construction of residential projects in remote areas. *2007 Ozone Plan* control measures typically affect existing industrial or commercial facilities that are already connected to appropriate sewerage facilities.

VII. HAZARD & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

As control measures undergo rule development, hazardous risk assessments and other analyses are conducted to identify any potential hazards. These are addressed in separate CEQA documents accompanying the rule in the rule development and adoption process.

VII. a), b) & c): Some control measures in the proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* that seek to regulate VOC emissions by establishing VOC content requirements for products such as coatings may result in reformulation of these products with materials that contain low or exempt VOC materials. It is possible that such reformulated products could have hazardous physical or chemical properties, which could create hazard impacts through the routine transport or disposal of these materials or through upset conditions involving the accidental release of these materials into the environment.

It is anticipated that future VOC content limits required for coatings and other products can be achieved, in part, through the use of coatings and products reformulated with acetone-exempt solvents and water-based solvents. Acetone is an exempt compound from air quality rules and regulations because of its low reactivity. The trend is to replace solvents with less toxic/less hazardous materials that do not contain hazardous air pollutants. To the extent that hazardous materials are used to replace (see Table 1 below) higher-VOC containing materials, it is conceivable that implementing these control measures could create hazard impacts.

As shown in the Table 1, the flammability classifications by the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) are the same for acetone, t-butyl acetate, toluene, xylene, MEK, isopropanol, butyl acetate, and isobutyl alcohol. Recognizing that as a “worst-case,” acetone has the lowest flash point, it still has the highest Lower Explosive Limit, which means that acetone vapors would not cause an explosion unless the vapor concentration exceeds 26,000 ppm. Under operating guidelines of working with flammable coatings under well-ventilated conditions, as prescribed by the fire department codes, it would be difficult to achieve concentrated streams of such vapors (SCAQMD, 2003).



TABLE 1 CHEMICAL CHARACTERISTICS FOR COMMON COATING SOLVENTS

Chemical Compounds	Flashpoint (°F)	Lower Explosive Limit (% by Vol.)	Flammability Classification (NFPA)
Toluene	40	1.3	Serious
Xylene	90	1.1	Serious
MEK	21	2.0	Serious
Isopropanol	53	2.0	Serious
Butyl Acetate	72	1.7	Serious
Isobutyl Alcohol	82	1.2	Serious
Stoddard Solvent	140	0.8	Moderate
Petroleum Distillates (Naphtha)	105	1.0	Severe
EGBE	141	1.1	Moderate
EGME	107	2.5	Moderate
EGEE	120	1.8	Moderate
Acetone	1.4	2.6	Serious
Di-Propyl Glycol	279	1	Slight
Propylene Glycol	210	2.6	Slight
Ethylene Glycol	232	3.2	Slight
Texanol	248	0.62	Slight
Oxsol 100	109	0.90	Slight
t-Butyl Acetate	59	1.5	Serious

Source: SCAQMD, 2003

As a “worst-case” assumption, it is assumed most affected coating categories would be reformulated with acetone to meet the VOC content limits. The labels and MSDSs accompanying acetone-based products caution the user regarding acetone’s flammability and advise the user to “keep the container away from heat, sparks, flame and all other sources of ignition.” All of the large coating manufacturers currently offer pure acetone for sale in quart or gallon containers with similar warnings.

The fire departments regulate spray application of flammable or combustible liquids. They require no open flame, spark-producing equipment or exposed surfaces exceeding the ignition temperature of the material being sprayed within the area. For open spraying, as with the field application of the acetone-based coatings, no spark-producing equipment or open flame shall be within 20 feet horizontally and 10 feet vertically of the spray area. Anyone not complying with the guidelines would be in violation of the current fire codes. The fire departments limit residential storage of flammable liquids to five gallons and recommends storage in a cool place. If the flammable coating container will be exposed to direct sunlight or heat, storage in cool water is recommended. Finally, all metal containers involving the transfer of five gallons or more should be grounded and bonded (SCAQMD, 2003).



Based upon the above considerations, hazard impacts and impacts to fire departments are anticipated to be less-than-significant. Similarly, any increase in future compliant coating materials are anticipated to result in a concurrent reduction in the number of accidental releases of coating materials. As a result, the net number of accidental releases is anticipated to remain constant. Furthermore, if manufacturers use solvents such as Texanol, propylene glycol, etc., in future compliant water-borne coatings, no significant adverse hazard impacts are anticipated to occur, because in general, these solvents are less flammable solvents as rated by the NFPA (SCAQMD, 2003). As control measures undergo rule development, hazardous risk assessments and other analyses are completed to identify any potential hazards.

Greater use of alternative clean fuels could also create hazard impacts in the event of an accidental release of these materials into the environment. Some potential incentive control measures, including the Heavy Duty Engine Incentive Program and the Light and Medium Duty Vehicle Incentive Program, would offer funding for the use of fuel additives to provide emission reductions.

Use of alternative fuels would require additional knowledge and training of owners/operators of fueling stations regarding maintaining and operating alternative fuel refueling stations and emergency responders. Therefore, when users of alternative fuels comply with existing regulations and recommended safety procedures, hazards impacts associated with the use of alternative clean-fuels would be the same or less than those of conventional fuels. Accordingly, significant hazard impacts are not anticipated from the increased use of alternative fuels.

The *2007 Ozone Plan* includes control measures that may require the storage and use of ammonia for selective catalytic reduction (SCR) systems. The facilities that would be affected by these measures include existing industrial and commercial facilities located in industrial/commercial zones. SCR systems are already being used in the SJVAB, and the potential increase in the use of ammonia due to control measures in the *2007 Ozone Plan* is negligible, compared to its current usage.

Ammonia may come in the anhydrous or aqueous form and may also be derived from urea. Urea is a solid form of nitrogen fertilizer that is commonly used in the SJVAB, and as such, has no hazard impact. About 80% of the ammonia produced in industry is used in agriculture as fertilizer, which is available in both anhydrous and aqueous form. Ammonia is also used as a refrigerant gas, to purify water supplies, and in the manufacture of plastics, explosives, fabrics, pesticides, dyes and other chemicals. It is found in many household and industrial-strength cleaning solutions. Cleaning solutions for industrial use contain higher concentrations of ammonia and can quickly cause irritation and burns.



Ammonia has not been classified as a carcinogen by California's Office of Environmental Health and Hazard Assessment. However, ammonia does have acute and chronic health effects. Acute exposure to ammonia at a concentration of 3,200 micrograms per cubic meter has been found to cause irritation of the eyes and respiratory tract. Higher concentrations cause conjunctivitis, laryngitis, and pulmonary edema. Long-term exposure to ammonia at concentrations of 200 micrograms per cubic meter or greater has been found to affect the respiratory tract. Since the olfactory organs can detect ammonia at very low concentrations, there is little chance that any long-term exposure at unhealthy concentrations could mistakenly occur. Also, since state and local safety regulations govern the handling, storage, and transport of ammonia, the potential for acute exposure is minimized. Adherence to these regulations is anticipated to minimize significant impacts associated with the use of ammonia. A limit on ammonia slip is normally included in permits to operate stationary sources, which should minimize potential air quality impacts associated with ammonia slip from these sources.

The use of anhydrous ammonia involves greater risk than aqueous ammonia because it is stored and transported under pressure. In the event of a leak or rupture of a tank, anhydrous ammonia is released and vaporizes. Aqueous ammonia is often used in place of anhydrous ammonia, in order to minimize the hazard impacts associated with ammonia use to less than significant.

Aqueous ammonia is a liquid at ambient temperatures and gas is only produced when a liquid pool from a spill evaporates. Under current Office of Emergency Services regulations implementing the California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) program, aqueous ammonia is regulated under California Health and Safety Code Section 2770.1. Regulations for the transport of hazardous materials along public highways are described in 49 CFR 173 and 177. Provisions of 49 CFR 172 consider 19% aqueous ammonia as a hazardous material. The United States Department of Transportation regulates the trucking of hazardous materials, including ammonia.

Compared to its current, widespread usage in agriculture and other industries, the minimal, potential increase in the use of ammonia due to control measures in the *2007 Ozone Plan* does not pose a hazardous impact to the public or the environment in the SJVAB. Furthermore, existing local, state and federal regulations governing its transport, use, and storage assure the safety of the public in the continued use of ammonia for agricultural production, industrial applications, household activities, and air pollution control.

VII. d): For any facilities affected by the *2007 Ozone Plan* control measures that are on the Government Code §65962.5 list, it is anticipated that they would continue to manage any and all hazardous materials in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations. Facilities on this list generally have some known contamination present on



the site. Most of the proposed control measures would not require the use of hazardous materials. The proposed control measures generally apply to commercial and industrial facilities and the control measures are not anticipated to create a significant hazard to the public even if the site is included on the Government Code §65962.5 lists. The construction of new facilities would require compliance with state and federal regulations and requirements for handling, treatment, and disposal of hazardous materials and waste. The proposed control measures are not anticipated to impact any clean up activities or contaminated sites; therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

VII. e) & f): The proposed project would not adversely affect any airport land use plan or result in any safety hazard for people residing or working in the District.

U.S. Department of Transportation – Federal Aviation Administration Advisory Circular AC 70/7460-2K provides information regarding the types of projects that may affect navigable airspace. Projects that involve construction or alteration of structures greater than 200 feet above ground level within a specified distance from the nearest runway; objects within 20,000 feet of an airport or seaplane base with at least one runway more than 3,200 feet in length and the object would exceed a slope of 100:1 horizontally (100 feet horizontally for each one foot vertically from the nearest point of the runway; etc., may adversely affect navigable airspace. Control measures in the proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* would not require construction of tall structures near airports so potential impacts to airport land use plans or safety hazards to people residing or working in the vicinity of local airports are not anticipated.

VII. g): The proposed project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Any existing commercial or industrial facilities affected by proposed control measures would typically have their own emergency response plans for their facilities already in place. Emergency response plans are typically prepared in coordination with the local city or county emergency plans to ensure the safety of not only the public, but the facility employees as well. Adopting the proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* is not anticipated to interfere with any emergency response procedures or evacuation plans.

VII. h): District measures in the proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* would typically affect existing commercial or industrial facilities in appropriately zoned areas. Since commercial and industrial areas are not typically located near wildland or forested areas, implementing control measures has no potential to increase the risk of wildland fires.

VIII. HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY

VIII. a) & f): The proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* control measures may require modifications to existing industrial or commercial facilities. It is assumed that any



affected facilities that generate wastewater and are subject to waste discharge or pretreatment requirements comply with all relevant wastewater requirements, waste discharge regulations, standards for stormwater runoff, and any other relevant requirements for direct discharges into sewer systems. These standards and permits require water quality monitoring and reporting for onsite water-related activities. Should the volume or discharge limits change as a result of implementing control measures, the facility would be required to consult with the appropriate Regional Water Quality Control Board and/or the local sanitation district to discuss these changes. Composting control measures are not expected to affect water quality since composting is already occurring. It is not anticipated that implementing the *2007 Ozone Plan* would cause any exceedances of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. It is anticipated that affected facilities would continue to comply with any applicable requirements of the appropriate Regional Water Quality Control Boards.

VIII. b): The proposed Plan contains no control measures that would substantially increase water usage at affected facilities. The CAFO control measure (S-AGR-2) could include the use of additional water for flushing as one of many control options, but the majority of facilities recycle flush water, and other options could be chosen. Additionally, although some affected facilities might have to make minor modifications to install control equipment, only minor trenching, grading, or other earth disturbing activities would be necessary for construction, so substantial volumes of additional water would not be needed as a dust suppressant. Thus, implementing the proposed project would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge or require the need for new or expanded water entitlements.

VIII. c), d), & e): The proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* generally is anticipated to impose control requirements on stationary sources at existing commercial or industrial facilities. As a result, the proposed control measures are not anticipated to generate new structures that could alter existing drainage patterns by altering the course of a river or stream that would result in substantial erosion, siltation, or flooding on or offsite, increase the rate or amount of surface runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, etc. Although minor modifications might occur at existing commercial or industrial facilities affected by the proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* control measures, these facilities have, typically, already been graded, and the areas surrounding them have likely already been paved over or landscaped. As a result, further minor modifications at affected facilities that may occur as a result of implementing the *2007 Ozone Plan* are not anticipated to alter existing drainage patterns or stormwater runoff.

Control Measure S-AGR-2 – Confined Animal Facilities, addresses the wastes from confined populations of animals in dairies and feedlots. Affected sites are zoned for agricultural uses. The potentially affected site retains the option of where it will specifically install the VOC control systems, thus selecting a site within the 100-year flood zone will be a decision by the site owners/operators and the local agency issuing a building permit for construction of the equipment and must comply with the regulations



of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. In fact, waste control techniques described in the rule may help to decrease the impact of animal waste on groundwater.

VIII. g), h), i), and j): The District does not have land use authority and is generally prohibited from encouraging or prohibiting specific land uses in specific locations in the Valley (California Health and Safety Code, Sec. 40716(b)). The proposed project does not include the new construction or relocation of existing housing or other types of facilities and, as such, would not require the placement of housing or other structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. As a result, the proposed project would not be anticipated to involve significant risks from flooding; expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding; or increase existing risks, if any, of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

IX. LAND USE/PLANNING

The Plan and its provisions have no characteristics that would directly change land use, zoning or land use plans or directly affect the land use classification, or location criteria of any public or private residential, commercial, industrial, or public land use facility. Any facilities affected by the proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* would still be anticipated to comply with, and not interfere with, any applicable land use plans, zoning ordinances, habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans. No provisions in the *2007 Ozone Plan* would directly affect these plans, policies, or regulations.

Local governments determine land use and other planning considerations; the *2007 Ozone Plan* would not alter present or planned land uses in the region or planning requirements. The air districts are precluded from infringing on city or county land use authority (California Health and Safety Code, Sec. 40716(b)). Even under District guidance documents (i.e. *The Air Quality Guidelines for General Plans*) or *2007 Ozone Plan* further study measures (i.e. control measure M-OTH-8 – amendments to Indirect Source Review (ISR)), developments would still need to comply with local land use requirements in a manner that would avoid significant adverse effects on existing neighborhoods. Thus, no significant adverse land use impact is anticipated.

Population growth, land development, housing, traffic and air quality are linked. The eight Metropolitan Planning Organizations within the SJVAB, which are also regional transportation planning agencies, account for these links when designing ways to improve air quality, transportation systems, land use, compatibility and housing opportunities in the region. Land use planning is handled at the local level and contributes to planning (e.g., growth projections), but the *2007 Ozone Plan* does not affect local government land use planning decisions.

For the *2007 Ozone Plan*, the SJV MPOs drafted the local RACM approach for the 8-hour Ozone Plan. Documentation regarding the proposed implementation of the recommended RACM strategy was transmitted for interagency consultation. A



response to comments received was prepared. It is important to note that the NO_x measures developed for the *2003 PM₁₀ Plan* will help attain the federal 8-hour ozone standards; however, since they are already federally approved, they are not included in this plan by reference. It is anticipated that implementation of the local RACM approach will be documented in the proposed plan.

X. Mineral Resources

No provisions of the proposed project would directly result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region and the residents of the state or of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. District control measures in the proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* are not anticipated to deplete non-renewable mineral resources, such as aggregate materials, metal ores, etc., at an accelerated rate or in a wasteful manner because District control measures are typically not mineral resource-intensive measures. Therefore, significant adverse impacts to mineral resources are not anticipated.

XI. NOISE

XI. a) - d): The *2007 Ozone Plan* may require existing commercial or industrial owners/operators of affected facilities to install air pollution control equipment or modify their operations to reduce stationary source emissions. Potential modifications would occur at facilities typically located in appropriately zoned industrial or commercial areas. Ambient noise levels in commercial and industrial areas are typically driven primarily by freeway and/or highway traffic in the area and any heavy-duty equipment used for materials manufacturing or processing at nearby facilities. Any installation of air pollution control equipment is not anticipated to substantially increase ambient [operational] noise levels in the area, either permanently or intermittently, or to expose people to excessive noise levels that would be noticeable above and beyond existing ambient levels. The *2007 Ozone Plan* may result in construction activities, e.g., the construction of control devices. Noise levels could temporarily increase in areas where construction activities are required, which would largely be commercial or industrial areas. Affected facilities would be required to comply with existing noise ordinances and meet noise standards established in local general plans, noise elements, or noise ordinances currently in effect. Similarly, any increased chipper use under new composting control measures would still be subject to local noise ordinances, and such activities would occur in ag areas with sufficient distances from habitation.

The proposed project is not anticipated to increase groundborne vibration levels because air pollution control equipment is not typically vibration intensive equipment. Consequently, the *2007 Ozone Plan* would not directly or indirectly cause substantial noise or excessive groundborne vibration impacts.



XI. e) & f): The District anticipates that affected facilities would still comply, and not interfere, with any applicable airport land use plans and disclose any excessive noise levels to affected residences and workers pursuant to existing rules, regulations and requirements, such as CEQA. It is assumed that operations in these areas are subject to and in compliance with existing community noise ordinances and applicable OSHA or Cal/OSHA workplace noise reduction requirements. In addition to noise generated by current operations, noise sources in each area may include nearby freeways, truck traffic to adjacent businesses, and operational noise from adjacent businesses. As noted in the previous item, there are no components of the proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* that would substantially increase ambient noise levels, either intermittently or permanently.

XII. POPULATION/HOUSING

The *2007 Ozone Plan* is not anticipated to generate any significant effects, either directly or indirectly, on the District's population or population distribution. No provisions in the *Plan* would result in the creation of any industry that would effect population growth or directly or indirectly induce the construction of single- or multiple-family units. The proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* generally affects existing commercial or industrial facilities located in predominantly industrial or commercial urbanized areas throughout the District. The District does not anticipate that affected facilities will be required to hire additional personnel to operate and maintain new control equipment on site, because air pollution control equipment is typically not labor-intensive equipment. In the event that new employees are hired, it is anticipated that the existing local labor pool in the District can accommodate any increase in demand for workers that might occur as a result of adopting the proposed *2007 Ozone Plan*. As such, adopting the proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* is not anticipated to result in significant changes in population densities or induce significant growth in population.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

The District does not anticipate that the *2007 Ozone Plan* will generate significant adverse impacts to public services (i.e., fire departments, police departments, and local governments). The proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered government facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives.

XIV. RECREATION

No provisions of the proposed project would directly affect land use plans, policies, ordinances, or regulations. Land use and other planning considerations are determined



by local governments. No land use or planning requirements, including those related to recreational facilities, would be altered by the proposal. The proposed project does not have the potential to directly or indirectly induce population growth or redistribution. As a result, the *2007 Ozone Plan* would not increase the use of or demand for existing neighborhood and/or regional parks or other recreational facilities, nor would it require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

XV. a), b) & f): Adopting the proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* is not anticipated to substantially increase vehicle trips or vehicle miles traveled in the San Joaquin Valley. The proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* includes mobile source-related control measures. Additional measures affecting vehicle emissions are anticipated to be implemented by the eight Metropolitan Planning Organizations in the San Joaquin Valley. These measures include strategies to enhance mobility by reducing congestion through transportation infrastructure improvements, mass transit improvements, increasing telecommunications products and services, enhanced bicycle and pedestrian facilities, etc. Specific strategies that serve to reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled, such as greater reliance on mass transit, ridesharing, telecommunications, etc., are anticipated to result in reducing traffic congestion. Although the population in the District is expected to continue to increase, implementing the strategies in the *2007 Ozone Plan* would ultimately result in greater percentages of the population using transportation modes other than single occupant vehicles. As a result, relative to population growth, existing traffic loads and the level of service designation for intersections District-wide would not be anticipated to decline at current rates, but could possibly improve. Therefore, implementing the *2007 Ozone Plan* control measures could ultimately provide transportation improvements and congestion reduction benefits.

Adopting the proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* is not anticipated to result in inadequate parking at any affected facilities in the District. To the extent that transportation and related control measures reduce or limit the growth in daily vehicle trips or charge additional parking fees, there could be a slight reduction in current or future demand for parking compared to existing levels of parking demand.

XV. c): The proposed project would not increase air traffic levels. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

XV. d): It is not anticipated that adopting the proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* would directly or indirectly increase roadway design hazards or incompatible risks. To the extent that implementing components of the transportation-related measures further develop roadway infrastructure or limit truck traffic to certain interstates, a reduction in roadway hazards or incompatible risks as part of any roadway infrastructure improvements.



XV. e): Controlling emissions at existing commercial or industrial facilities and establishing mobile source controls are not anticipated to affect in any way emergency access routes at any affected commercial or industrial facilities. Controlling emissions (from stationary sources in particular) is not anticipated to require construction of any structures that might obstruct emergency access routes at any affected facilities.

XV. g): Adopting the *2007 Ozone Plan* would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation programs. In fact, the transportation-related control measures would specifically encourage and provide incentives for implementing alternative transportation programs and strategies. The proposed *2007 Ozone Plan* is not anticipated to generate any significant adverse impacts to transportation or traffic systems.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The Plan will not result in any demand for new utilities or service systems or result in any substantial demand on existing sources. There are no provisions in the Plan that would affect existing communication systems, sewer or septic tanks, or regional water treatment or distribution facilities. The Plan would not result in any demand for new utilities or service systems, or result in any substantial demand on existing sources.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

XVII. a): The proposed project is not anticipated to significantly adversely affect any biological resources including wildlife and the resources on which it relies, 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. Overall improvements in air quality are, ultimately, anticipated to provide substantial benefits to local biological resources in the District.

XVII. b): The *2007 Ozone Plan* is not anticipated to create cumulatively considerable impacts.

XVII. c): The *2007 Ozone Plan* is not anticipated to create significant adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The District anticipates that as the plan is implemented and the air quality with respect to ozone improves, substantial human health benefits would occur.



F. INITIAL STUDY DISTRIBUTION LIST

59 cities within District Boundaries (Planning Directors)

Eight Counties within District Boundaries (Planning Directors)

Ms. Cynthia Marvin
Air Quality & Trans. Plng. Branch
Air Resources Board
P.O. Box 2815
Sacramento, CA 95812

Mr. Michael J. Brady
Caltrans, District 6
P.O. Box 12616
Fresno, CA 93779

Mr. Ken Baxter
Caltrans, District 10
P.O. Box 2048
Stockton, CA 95201

Mr. Ronald E. Brummett
Kern COG
1401 19th Street, Suite 300
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Mr. Bill Zumwalt
KCAG
1400 W. Lacey Blvd.
Hanford, CA 93230

Mr. George Finney
TCAG
5961 South Mooney Blvd.
Visalia, CA 93277

Mr. Jesse Brown
MCAG
369 West 18th Street
Merced, CA 95340

Ms. Barbara Goodwin



COFCG
2100 Tulare Street, Ste. 619
Fresno, CA 93721-2111

Mr. Andrew T. Chelsey
SJCCOG
555 E. Weber Ave
Stockton, CA 95202-2804

Ms. Patricia Taylor-Maley
MCTC
1816 Howard Road, Ste. 8
Madera, CA 93637

Mr. Vince Harris
SAAG
900 "H" Street, Ste. D
Modesto, CA 95354