San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District

2012 PM2.5 Plan

Initial Study and Proposed Negative Declaration

November 2012

SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT
GOVERNING BOARD 2012

CHAIR: WILLIAM O'BRIEN
Supervisor, Stanislaus County

VICE CHAIR: SKIP BARWICK
Vice Mayor, City of Tulare

MEMBERS:

OLIVER L. BAINES III
Councilmember, City of Fresno

TONY BARBA
Supervisor, Kings County

SALLY J. BOMPREZZI
Councilmember, City of Madera

JUDITH G. CASE
Supervisor, Fresno County

RONN DOMINICI
Supervisor, Madera County

HENRY JAY FORMAN, PH.D
Appointed by Governor

HAROLD HANSON
Councilmember, City of Bakersfield

LEROY ORNELLAS
Supervisor, San Joaquin County

ALEXANDER C. SHERRIFFS, M.D.
Appointed by Governor

CHRIS VIERRA
Mayor, City of Ceres

HUB WALSH
Supervisor, Merced County

RAYMOND A. WATSON
Supervisor, Kern County

J. STEVEN WORTHLEY
Supervisor, Tulare County

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL OFFICER:

SEYED SADREDIN

Initial Study and Proposed Negative Declaration

2012 PM2.5 Plan

November 2012

Public Review Period Begins: November 9, 2012
Public Review Period Ends: December 8, 2012 at 5:00 P.M.

LEAD AGENCY: SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT

1990 East Gettysburg Avenue
Fresno CA 93726-0244

Agency CEQA Contact:	Mark Montelongo, Senior Air Quality Specialist Phone: (559) 230-6000 Fax: (559) 230-6061
Project Sponsor and Address:	San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District 1990 E. Gettysburg Avenue Fresno CA 93726-0244
Project Location:	The *2012 PM2.5 Plan* applies to emission sources (primarily emission sources of directly emitted PM2.5, nitrogen oxides (NOx), and sulfur dioxide (SO_2),) located within the boundaries of the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB) (see Exhibit 1, Map of Basin Boundaries).
Project Contact:	Jessica Fierro, Supervising Air Quality Specialist Anna Myers, Senior Air Quality Specialist Phone: (559) 230-6000

Exhibit 1

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District Boundaries

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. Introduction

CEQA requires each public agency to adopt objectives, criteria, and specific procedures consistent with CEQA Statutes and the CEQA Guidelines for administering its responsibilities under CEQA, including the orderly evaluation of projects and preparation of environmental documents. The District adopted its *Environmental Review Guidelines* (ERG) in 2001. The ERG was prepared to comply with this requirement and is an internal document used to comply with CEQA.

The basic purposes of CEQA are to:

- Inform governmental decision-makers and the public about the potential, significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
- Identify the ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced.
- Prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governmental agency finds the changes to be feasible.
- Disclose to the public the reasons why a governmental agency approved the project in the manner the agency chose if significant environmental effects are involved.

Under CEQA the Lead Agency is required to:

- Conduct preliminary reviews to determine if applications are subject to CEQA [CCR §15060].
- Conduct review to determine if projects are exempt from CEQA [CCR §15061].
- Prepare Initial Studies for projects that may have adverse environmental impacts [CCR §15063].
- Determine the significance of the environmental effects caused by the project [CCR §15064].
- Prepare Negative Declarations or Mitigated Negative Declarations for projects with no significant environmental impacts [CCR §15070].
- Prepare, or contract to prepare, EIRs for projects with significant environmental impacts [CCR §15081].
- Adopt reporting or monitoring programs for the changes made to projects or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment [PRC §21081.6 & CCR §15097].
- Comply with CEQA noticing and filing requirements.

B. Authority

The District has discretionary authority to implement the District control measures, incentives, and other District options identified in the Plan. As such, the District serves as Lead Agency; California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §15367.

C. Project Background Information

Project Background

The *2012 PM2.5 Plan* (Plan) presents the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's (District) strategy for achieving the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 microns or less (PM2.5), as established by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 2006.

After approval by the California Air Resources Board (ARB), the Plan will be submitted to EPA for review. Following receipt of the Plan, EPA must determine Plan completeness within six months. As required by the federal Clean Air Act (CAA) Section 110k, the EPA must act on the Plan within one year of finding the Plan complete. EPA approval of the Plan places it in the State Implementation Plan (SIP) as required by the federal Clean Air Act (CAA) and the EPA's *Clean Air Fine Particle Implementation Rule, Final Rule* (72 *FR* 20586-20667).

In addition to meeting the requirements of the CAA and containing measures needed to attain the NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable. The 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 developed the Plan with an extensive public process, including workshops and draft documents provided by the District in April, June, and October of 2012.

Project Description

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

Executive Summary
The Executive Summary discusses the District's commitment to expeditious PM2.5 attainment and summarizes key Plan concepts.

Chapter 1 Introduction
This chapter summarizes applicable federal requirements, the District's Guiding Principles for the Plan, the Valley's unique PM2.5 challenges, and the health impacts associated with PM2.5

Chapter 2 Risk-based Strategy
This chapter describes the District's Risk-based Strategy is being utilized in the development of this Plan to maximize public health benefits.

Chapter 3 Air Quality in the San Joaquin Valley: Challenges and Trends
While presented with unique geographical and meteorological challenges, the San Joaquin Valley has made significant progress in reducing total PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursor emissions. PM2.5 concentrations have also decreased as emissions have been reduced, despite impacts of uncontrollable meteorological conditions. This chapter summarizes the Valley's PM2.5 challenges, the progress that has been made reducing emissions, and recent ambient PM2.5 trends.

Chapter 4 Scientific Foundation and PM2.5 Modeling Results
This chapter provides an overview of the scientific foundation for this PM2.5 plan. It describes Study Agency and other research efforts related to this plan, the nature of PM2.5 in the Valley, and PM2.5 species. It also summarizes the regional modeling effort and the results of the analyses conducted for this plan. These results show which emissions control strategies will most effectively assure attainment of the 2006 PM2.5 NAAQS and improved PM2.5 air quality throughout the Valley.

Chapter 5 Regulatory Control Measures
This chapter contains a discussion about regulations contributing to PM2.5 improvement, a description of federal RACT/RACM requirements, and the District's ongoing approach for evaluating potential new control measures for opportunities for emissions reductions. The regulatory control strategies will be summarized in this chapter accompanied by a rule making schedule.

Chapter 6 Incentive Programs
This chapter describes the role of the District's robust incentive program in reducing air pollution and expediting attainment.

Chapter 7 Technology Advancement
This chapter discusses the District's Technology Advancement program, through which the District identifies, solicits, and supports technology advancement opportunities. The goal is to accelerate technology development that may provide additional emission reductions as part of the District's multi-faceted approach to attain increasingly stringent ozone and PM2.5 air quality standards. Meeting such standards will require significant advancements in low-emissions technologies from mobile and stationary sources.

Chapter 8 Innovative Strategies
This chapter describes the District's additional efforts to reduce air pollution emissions through policy efforts, interagency collaboration, and community outreach.

Chapter 9 Progress Toward Attainment of the 2006 PM2.5 Standard
This chapter explains and demonstrates reasonable further progress (RFP), demonstrates the Valley's attainment year, synthesizes the RACM demonstration, and discusses contingency measures.

Appendices

The Plan makes reference to the following appendices:

Appendix A: Ambient PM2.5 Data Analysis
Appendix B: Emissions Inventory
Appendix C: Mobile Source Control Strategies
Appendix D: Stationary and Area Source Control Evaluation
Appendix E: California Regional PM10/PM2.5 Air Quality Study Publications
Appendix F: SJV PM2.5 SIP Modeling Protocol
Appendix G: Weight of Evidence
Appendix H: Emissions Reductions Credits (ERC)

Other appendices may be added as needed to show additional analysis relevant to Plan development.

Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required

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. ARB must approve this plan and then officially transmit it to EPA. EPA's final rule approving the plan would place it in to the SIP.

D. Decision to Prepare a Proposed Negative Declaration

District staff has the proposed PM2.5 Plan, incorporated herein by reference, which demonstrates that the proposed Plan would not have an adverse impact on air quality. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15063(a), District staff prepared an Initial Study for the proposed project. The District finds that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. District staff has prepared a Negative Declaration for the project. Upon approval of the proposed Plan by the District's Governing Board, District staff will file a Notice of Determination with each County Clerk within the boundaries of the District, CEQA Guidelines §15075(d).

E. 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 and Forestry Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology / Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ 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

F. Determination

I certify that the 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 environmen and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION has been 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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION has been 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 "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact 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. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: _____ Date: NOV 0 8 2012

Printed name: David Warner

Title: Director of Permit Services

G. Environmental Impact Checklist

I. Aesthetics Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock, outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X

I. Aesthetics

Scenic Vistas and Visual Character (a-d)

Conclusion: The Project will not have an impact on scenic vistas, damage scenic resources, degrade visual character in and around the sites or create new sources of light or glare.

Discussion: The Plan demonstrates that existing regulations recently adopted under previous air quality attainment demonstration plans and CEQA processes also serve as control measures for this PM2.5 Plan. These adopted regulations will dramatically reduce directly emitted PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursors (NOx and SOx) as they are fully implemented over the next few years, greatly contributing to the Valleys progress towards the 2006 PM2.5 standard. The Plan also includes additional control measures for future consideration and adoption; however, these new control measures will be developed within their own public process and CEQA analysis. As such, 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. In addition, the Plan would not create aesthetically offensive sites visible to the public and no significant adverse aesthetic or recreation impacts are expected from the Plan. As a result, the Plan may have a beneficial effect on scenic resources by improving visibility as well as improving air quality in the San Joaquin Valley. Therefore, the District concludes there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that approval of the Plan would have a detrimental impact on aesthetics, as identified above (a-d).

Mitigation: None required.

References: 2012 PM2.5 Plan

II. Agricultural Resources	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 (1197) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agricultural and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resource Board. 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?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resource Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104 (g))?				X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

II. Agricultural Resources

Farm and Forest Lands (a-e)

Conclusion: The Project will not conflict with existing zoning and will not have an impact on agriculture and forest lands.

Discussion: The Plan demonstrates that existing regulations recently adopted under previous air quality attainment demonstration plans and CEQA processes also serve as control measures for this PM2.5 Plan. These adopted regulations will dramatically reduce directly emitted PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursors (NOx and SOx) as they

are fully implemented over the next few years, greatly contributing to the Valleys progress towards the 2006 PM2.5 standard. The Plan also includes additional control measures for future consideration and adoption; however, these new control measures will be developed within their own public process and CEQA analysis. Control measures provided in the Plan will not result in substantive conversion of prime or unique farmland to non-agricultural use and will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contract. PM2.5 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 PM2.5 emissions on plants and animals. Any new regulatory control measure commitment identified in the Plan, will be developed within its own public process and CEQA analysis. Therefore, the District concludes there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that approval and implementation of the project would have a detrimental impact on agricultural resources, as identified above (a-e).

Mitigation: None required.

References: 2012 PM2.5 Plan

III. Air Quality	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
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?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
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)?				X
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

III. Air Quality (a-e)

Conclusion: This project will not conflict with any other air quality plans, substantially contribute to or create an air quality violation, result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or create objectionable odors.

Discussion: The Plan demonstrates that existing regulations recently adopted under previous air quality attainment demonstration plans and CEQA processes also serve as control measures for this PM2.5 Plan. These adopted regulations will reduce directly emitted PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursors (NOx and SOx) as they are fully implemented over the next few years per the established timeline in the adopted rules, greatly contributing to the Valley's progress towards the 2006 PM2.5 standard. The Plan also includes additional control measures for future consideration and adoption; however, these new control measures will be developed in the future and will have their own public process and CEQA evaluation. Hazardous risk assessments and other analyses will be completed as individual rules and regulations are developed and adopted.

Federal and state laws require emission control measures in areas like the San Joaquin Valley where air pollution exceeds ambient air quality standards. Attainment is achieved through adopting and implementing cost-effective air pollution control measures, providing meaningful incentives for reducing emissions, and by developing creative

alternatives for achieving emissions reductions. The purpose of the Plan is to move the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin toward attainment of the federal and state ambient air quality standards for PM2.5 through incentive and control strategy implementation. District staff has prepared an *Emission Reduction Analysis,* incorporated herein by reference which demonstrates that implementation of the Plan would result in 25.0 tons per day reduction in PM2.5 emissions, 256.6 tons per day of NOx emissions, and 3.8 tons per day of SOx emissions from the winter inventory. Thus, implementation of the Plan would result in a benefit for improving air quality in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin.

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. 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.

The Plan identifies control options to meet target emissions reductions of each control measure without fully developing the details for how those reductions would be achieved. Subsequent rule making will determine the actual air quality reductions and impacts. As such, these issues will continue to be evaluated as the Plan's control measure commitments are developed in their post-plan public processes. However, the net result is improved air quality. Therefore, the District concludes there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that approval of the Plan would have a detrimental impact on air quality, as identified above (a-e).

Mitigation: None required.

References: 2012 PM2.5 Plan

IV. Biological Resources Would the Project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated**	**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 California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
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?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				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?				X

IV. Biological Resources (a-f)

Conclusion: The Project will have no impact on candidate, sensitive, special status species or any adopted conservation plans.

Discussion: The Plan demonstrates that existing regulations recently adopted under previous air quality attainment demonstration plans and CEQA processes also serve as control measures for this PM2.5 Plan. These adopted regulations will dramatically reduce directly emitted PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursors (NOx and SOx) as they

are fully implemented over the next few years, greatly contributing to the Valleys progress towards the 2006 PM2.5 standard. The plan also includes additional control measures for future consideration and adoption; however, these new control measures will be developed within their own public process and CEQA analysis.

Adoption of the Plan and subsequent implementation are not expected to adversely affect existing plant or animal species or communities, unique or endangered plant or animal species, or agricultural crops. No significant adverse impacts to biological resources are anticipated from the Plan 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 plants and animal species, as well as to humans in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin.

The Plan would not affect any current 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, et., through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means. Implementation of the Plan is not anticipated to affect land use plans, local policies or ordinances. Therefore, the District concludes there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that approval of the Plan would have a detrimental impact on biological resources, as identified above (a-f).

Mitigation: None required.

References: 2012 PM2.5 Plan

V. Cultural Resources **Would the Project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?				**X**
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?				**X**
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				**X**
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				**X**

V. Cultural Resources (a-d)

Conclusion: The Project will not have an impact on cultural resources.

Discussion: The Plan demonstrates that existing regulations recently adopted under previous air quality attainment demonstration plans and CEQA processes also serve as control measures for this PM2.5 Plan. These adopted regulations will dramatically reduce directly emitted PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursors (NOx and SOx) as they are fully implemented over the next few years, greatly contributing to the Valleys progress towards the 2006 PM2.5 standard. The Plan also includes additional control measures for future consideration and adoption; however, these new control measures will be developed within their own public process and CEQA analysis. As a result, significant impacts to cultural resources are not expected from 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. Therefore, the District concludes there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that approval of the Plan would have a detrimental impact on cultural resources, as identified above (a-d).

Mitigation: None needed.

References: 2012 PM2.5 Plan

VI. Geology / Soils **Would the Project**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				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?				X
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?				X
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?				X

VI. Geology/Soils (a-e)

Conclusion: The Project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil nor have an impact on the capacity of the soil to support wastewater disposal systems.

Discussion: The Plan demonstrates that existing regulations recently adopted under previous air quality attainment demonstration plans and CEQA processes also serve as control measures for this PM2.5 Plan. These adopted regulations will dramatically reduce directly emitted PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursors (NOx and SOx) as they are fully implemented over the next few years, greatly contributing to the Valleys progress towards the 2006 PM2.5 standard. The Plan also includes additional control

measures for future consideration and adoption; however, these new control measures will be developed within their own public process and CEQA analysis.

Plan implementation provides no provisions 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. 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 or 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 prohibiting 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 geological hazards, faults, rupture, seismic ground shaking, seismic ground failure, seiche, tsunami or volcanic hazard.

The proposed Plan's control measures are focused on efforts to reduce PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursors (NOx and SOx) from disturbed and already existing operations. Any resulting facility modifications are not anticipated to require substantial grading or construction activities. Similarly, the proposed 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 over-covering 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, as identified above (a-e).

Mitigation: None required.

References: *2012 PM2.5 Plan*

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions **Would the Project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X

VII. Greenhouse Gases (a, b)

Discussion: Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are gases that absorb and emit radiation within the thermal infrared range, trapping heat in the earth's atmosphere. There are no "attainment" concentration standards established by the Federal or State government for greenhouse gases. In fact, GHGs are not generally thought of as traditional air pollutants because greenhouse gases, and their impacts, are global in nature, while traditional "criteria" air pollutants affect the health of people and other living things at ground level, in the general region of their release to the atmosphere. Some greenhouse gases occur naturally and are emitted into the atmosphere through natural processes. Other GHGs are created and emitted solely through human activities. The principal greenhouse gases that enter the atmosphere because of human activities are carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), and fluorinated carbons. Additional information on GHG and global climate change can be found in the District staff report titled: *Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impacts Under the California Environmental Quality Act.*

The PM2.5 Plan provides a strategy by the District for achieving the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 microns or less (PM2.5), as established by EPA in 2006. The Plan applies to emission sources (primarily sources of directly emitted PM2.5 nitrogen oxides (NOx), and sulfur dioxide (SO_2), located within the boundaries of the San Joaquin Valley. The Plan demonstrates that existing regulations recently adopted under previous air quality attainment demonstration plans and CEQA processes also serve as control measures for this PM2.5 Plan. The existing control measures identified in the Plan are focused on those efforts, to contribute to reducing PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursors (NOx and SOx) from disturbed and already existing operations.

The Plan also includes additional control measures for future consideration and adoption; however, these new control measures will be developed with their own public process and CEQA analysis to determine air quality and GHG impacts.

The potential exists for certain control measures in the plan to decrease GHG emissions. The rulemaking process will identify the control options of each the control measure commitment. As noted above, the details resulting from the rulemaking process would determine the overall GHG and potential climate change impact.

As a result, these impacts will continue to be evaluated as the Plan's control measure commitments are developed in their post-Plan public processes. The desired goal is improved air quality for the San Joaquin Valley. Therefore, the District concludes there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that approval of the Plan would have a detrimental impact on greenhouse gas emissions, as identified above (a,b).

Mitigation: None required.

References: 2012 PM2.5 Plan

VIII. Hazards & Hazardous Materials **Would the Project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated**	**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?				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?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
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?				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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?				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?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				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?				X

VIII. Hazards & Hazardous Materials (a-h)

Conclusion: The Project will not expose the public to hazardous materials. The Project will not interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans; nor will it expose people or structures to risks from wildland fires.

Discussion: The Plan demonstrates that existing regulations recently adopted under previous air quality attainment demonstration plans and CEQA processes also serve as control measures for this PM2.5 Plan. These adopted regulations will dramatically reduce directly emitted PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursors (NOx and SOx) as they are fully implemented over the next few years, greatly contributing to the Valleys progress towards the 2006 PM2.5 standard. The Plan also includes additional control measures for future consideration and adoption; however, these new control measures will be developed within their own public process and CEQA analysis. As control measures undergo rule development, hazardous risk assessments and other analyses are conducted to identify any potential hazards. These potential hazards are addressed in separate CEQA documents accompanying the rule, in the rule development and adoption process.

It is anticipated that facilities included on the Government Code §65962.5 list affected by the Plans control measures would continue to manage any and all hazardous materials in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations. Most of the control measures identified in the Plan are not anticipated to impact any clean-up activities or contaminated sites; therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

Implementation of the Plan would not adversely affect any airport land use plan or result in any safety hazard for people residing or working in the San Joaquin Valley. The 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 200,000 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. However, the control measures provided in the 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.

The Plan would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Any existing facilities affected by the control measures provided in the Plan 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. Adoption of the proposed Plan is not anticipated to interfere with any emergency response procedures or evacuation plans.

In addition, since facilities that are affected by the Plan are not typically located near wildland or forest areas, implementing control measures has no potential to increase the risk of wildland fires.

Therefore, the District concludes there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that approval of the Plan would have a detrimental impact on hazardous and hazardous materials, as identified above (a-h).

Mitigation: None required.

References: 2012 PM2.5 Plan, Government Code §65962.5

IX. Hydrology / Water Quality **Would the Project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				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)?				X
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?				X
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?				X
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
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?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
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?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow				X

IX. Hydrology / Water Quality (a-j)

Conclusion: The Project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and will not degrade water quality. The Project will not have an impact groundwater supplies, interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, or drainage patterns. The Project will not expose people or structures to flood hazards, seiche, tsunamis or mudflows.

Discussion: The Plan demonstrates that existing regulations recently adopted under previous air quality attainment demonstration plans and CEQA processes also serve as control measures for this PM2.5 Plan. These adopted regulations will dramatically reduce directly emitted PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursors (NOx and SOx) as they are fully implemented over the next few years, greatly contributing to the Valleys progress towards the 2006 PM2.5 standard.The Plan also includes additional control measures for future consideration and adoption; however, these new control measures will be developed within their own public process and CEQA analysis.

Implementation of the Plan would not require action that would violate any established local, state, or federal standards. Any potential facilities affected by the Plan that generate wastewater are subject to waste discharge or pretreatment requirements are assumed to 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. As such, implementation of the Plan would not cause any exceedances of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

The Plan contains no control measure commitments that would substantially increase water usage at facilities, generate any new structures that could alter existing drainage patterns. In addition, 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 Plan does not require any 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. Therefore, the District concludes that there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that approval of the Plan would have a detrimental impact on aesthetics, as identified above (a-j).

Mitigation: None required.

References: 2012 PM2.5 Plan

X. Land Use / Planning **Would the Project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Physically divide an established community?				**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?				**X**
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				**X**

X. Land Use/Planning (a, b, c)

Conclusion: The Project will not divide an established community or conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations.

Discussion: The Plan demonstrates that existing regulations already adopted under previous air quality attainment demonstration plans can also serve as control measures for this PM2.5 Plan. These adopted regulations will dramatically reduce directly emitted PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursors (NOx and SOx) as they are fully implemented over the next few years, greatly contributing to the Valleys progress towards the 2006 PM2.5 standard. Several new control measure commitments were identified in the Plan, however, these new control measures will be developed within its own public process and CEQA analysis.

The District does not have land use authority and is generally prohibited from encouraging or prohibiting specific land uses. As such, 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 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 Plan would directly affect these plans, policies, or regulations.

Population growth, land development, housing, traffic, and air quality are linked. The eight Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) 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 Plan does not affect local government land use planning decisions.

The eight MPOs drafted the local Reasonably Available Control Measure (RACM) approach for the Plan. Implementation of the local RACM approach is documented in the proposed plan.

Mitigation: None required.

References: 2012 PM2.5 Plan

XI. Mineral Resources **Would the Project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				**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?				**X**

XI. Mineral Resources (a, b)

Conclusion: The Project will not have an impact on mineral resources.

Discussion: The Plan demonstrates that existing regulations recently adopted under previous air quality attainment demonstration plans and CEQA processes also serve as control measures for this PM2.5 Plan. These adopted regulations will dramatically reduce directly emitted PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursors (NOx and SOx) as they are fully implemented over the next few years, greatly contributing to the Valleys progress towards the 2006 PM2.5 standard. The Plan also includes additional control measures for future consideration and adoption; however, these new control measures will be developed within their own public process and CEQA analysis.

Implementation of the Plan would not 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 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, as identified above (a-b).

Mitigation: None required.

References

2012 PM2.5 Plan

XII. Noise **Would the Project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated**	**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?				X
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?				X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?				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 or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?				X
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?				X

XII. Noise (a-f)

Conclusion: The Project will not result in increased noise exposure and will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Discussion: The Plan demonstrates that existing regulations recently adopted under previous air quality attainment demonstration plans and CEQA processes also serve as control measures for this PM2.5 Plan. These adopted regulations will dramatically reduce directly emitted PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursors (NOx and SOx) as they are fully implemented over the next few years, greatly contributing to the Valleys progress towards the 2006 PM2.5 standard. The Plan also includes additional control measures for future consideration and adoption; however, these new control measures will be developed within their own public process and CEQA analysis.

The Plan may result in affected facilities installing air pollution control equipment or modify their operations to reduce potential stationary source emissions. However, any new regulatory control measure commitment identified in the Plan, will be developed within its own public process and CEQA analysis.

Implementation of the Plan is not anticipated to substantially increase ambient (operational) noise levels, either permanently or intermittently, or expose people to excessive noise levels that would be noticeably above and beyond existing ambient levels. In addition, the Plan is not anticipated to increase any groundborne vibration levels because air pollution control equipment is not typically vibration intensive. Consequently, the Plan would not directly or indirectly cause substantial noise or excessive groundborne vibration impacts.

Implementation of the Plan would not interfere with any applicable airport land use plans and would not result in any excessive noise levels to affected residences and workers pursuant to existing rules, regulations and requirements. Potential facilities affected by the control measures identified in the Plan, are still subject to compliance with existing community noise ordinances and applicable OSHA or Cal/OSHA workplace noise reduction requirements. As noted in the above discussion, there are no components of the proposed Plan that would substantially increase ambient noise levels, either intermittently or permanently. Therefore, the District concludes there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that approval of the Plan would have a detrimental impact on noise, as identified above (a-f).

Mitigation: None required.

References: *2012 PM2.5 Plan*

XIII. Population / 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)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

XIII. Population and Housing (a, b, c)

Conclusion: The Project will not result in a substantial growth in population growth or the displacement of people or housing units.

Discussion: The Plan demonstrates that existing regulations recently adopted under previous air quality attainment demonstration plans and CEQA processes also serve as control measures for this PM2.5 Plan. These adopted regulations will dramatically reduce directly emitted PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursors (NOx and SOx) as they are fully implemented over the next few years, greatly contributing to the Valleys progress towards the 2006 PM2.5 standard. The Plan also includes additional control measures for future consideration and adoption; however, these new control measures will be developed within their own public process and CEQA analysis.

The Plan is not anticipated to generate any significant effects, either directly or indirectly, on the District's population or population distribution. Provisions in the Plan would not result in the creation of any industry that would affect population growth or directly or indirectly induce the construction of single- or multiple-family units. 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 Plan. As such, adopting the proposed Plan is not anticipated to result in significant changes in population densities or induce significant growth in population. Therefore, the District concludes there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that approval of the Plan would have a detrimental impact on population and housing, as identified above (a-c).

Mitigation: None required.

References: *2012 PM2.5 Plan*

XIV. Public Services **Would the Project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) 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:				
i) Fire protection?				X
ii) Police protection?				X
iii) Schools?				X
iv) Parks?				X
v) Other public facilities?				X

XIV. Public Services

Conclusion: The Project will not require additional public services and will not negatively impact the existing facility's ability to provide services.

Discussion: The Plan demonstrates that existing regulations recently adopted under previous air quality attainment demonstration plans and CEQA processes also serve as control measures for this PM2.5 Plan. These adopted regulations will dramatically reduce directly emitted PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursors (NOx and SOx) as they are fully implemented over the next few years, greatly contributing to the Valleys progress towards the 2006 PM2.5 standard. The Plan also includes additional control measures for future consideration and adoption; however, these new control measures will be developed within their own public process and CEQA analysis.

The implementation of the Plan is not anticipated to generate significant adverse impacts to public services (i.e., fire departments, police departments, and local governments). The Plan 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. Therefore, the District concludes there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that approval of the Plan would have a detrimental impact on public services, as identified above (a).

Mitigation: None required.

References: *2012 PM2.5 Plan*

XV. Recreation **Would the Project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated**	**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?				X
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

XV. Recreational Facilities (a, b)

Conclusion: The Project will not have an impact on neighborhood or regional parks, or any other local recreational facilities.

Discussion: The Plan demonstrates that existing regulations recently adopted under previous air quality attainment demonstration plans and CEQA processes also serve as control measures for this PM2.5 Plan. These adopted regulations will dramatically reduce directly emitted PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursors (NOx and SOx) as they are fully implemented over the next few years, greatly contributing to the Valleys progress towards the 2006 PM2.5 standard.The Plan also includes additional control measures for future consideration and adoption; however, these new control measures will be developed within their own public process and CEQA analysis.

Provisions of the proposed Plan would not directly affect land use plans, policies, ordinances, or regulations. Land use and other planning considerations are determined by local governments. In addition, land use or planning requirements including those related to recreational facilities, would not be altered by the Plan. The proposed Plan does not have the potential to directly or indirectly induce population growth or redistribution. As a result, the 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. Further, improvements in air quality from the Plan are expected to provide health benefits to plant and animal species, potentially improving recreational facilities. Therefore, the District concludes there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that approval of the Plan would have a detrimental impact on recreational facilities, as identified above (a,b).

Mitigation: None required.

References: 2012 PM2.5 Plan

XVI. Transportation / Traffic **Would the Project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation systems, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				X
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				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?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				X

XVI. Transportation/Traffic (a-f)

Conclusion: The Project will not conflict with any circulation plans, congestion management programs, or alternative transportation facilities. Project related traffic will not change air traffic patterns or include hazardous design features and, therefore, will not pose a safety risk.

Discussion: The Plan demonstrates that existing regulations recently adopted under previous air quality attainment demonstration plans and CEQA processes also serve as control measures for this PM2.5 Plan. These adopted regulations will dramatically reduce directly emitted PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursors (NOx and SOx) as they are fully implemented over the next few years, greatly contributing to the Valleys progress towards the 2006 PM2.5 standard. The Plan also includes additional control measures for future consideration and adoption; however, these new control measures will be developed within their own public process and CEQA analysis.

Implementation of the Plan is not anticipated to substantially increase vehicle trips or vehicle miles traveled in the San Joaquin Valley. As described in the Plan, the District supports alternative transportation and other efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled, as these efforts contribute to improve PM2.5 air quality. Therefore, implementing the Plan control measures could ultimately provide transportation improvements and congestion reduction benefits.

The Plan contains no provisions pertaining to air traffic levels and is not anticipated to result in direct or indirect increases in roadway design hazards or incompatible risks. Implementation of the Plan would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation programs. The Plan is not anticipated to generate any significant adverse impacts to transportation or traffic systems. Therefore, the District concludes there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that approval of the Plan would have a detrimental impact on transportation/traffic, as identified above (a-f).

Population growth, land development, housing, traffic, and air quality are linked. The eight Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) 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 Plan does not affect local government land use planning decisions.

The eight MPOs drafted the local Reasonably Available Control Measure (RACM) approach for the Plan. Implementation of the local RACM approach is documented in the proposed plan.

Mitigation: None required.

References: 2012 PM2.5 Plan

XVII. Utilities / Service Systems **Would the Project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				**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 effects?				**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 effects?				**X**
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				**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?				**X**
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs?				**X**
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				**X**

XVII. Utilities / Service Systems (a-g)

Conclusion: The Project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements or require the construction of new wastewater or storm water facilities. The Project will have sufficient water supplies and new or expanded entitlements are not required. The Project will comply with all solid waste regulations and will not have an impact on landfills.

Discussion: The Plan demonstrates that existing regulations recently adopted under previous air quality attainment demonstration plans and CEQA processes also serve as control measures for this PM2.5 Plan. These adopted regulations will dramatically reduce directly emitted PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursors (NOx and SOx) as they are fully implemented over the next few years, greatly contributing to the Valleys progress towards the 2006 PM2.5 standard. The Plan also includes additional control measures for future consideration and adoption; however, these new control measures will be developed within their own public process and CEQA analysis.

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. Therefore, the District concludes there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that approval of the Plan would have a detrimental impact on utilities and service systems, as identified above (a-d).

Mitigation: None required.

References: 2012 PM2.5 Plan

XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance **Would the Project**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated**	**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?				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)?				X
c) Does the Project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Impacts on the Environment and Special Status Species and Cumulative Impacts (a, b)

Conclusion: The Project will have no impact on the environment and special status plant and animal species. In addition, the Project will not have cumulatively significant impacts on the environment, plant and animal species, or the human population.

Discussion: The Plan demonstrates that existing regulations recently adopted under previous plans and CEQA processes also serve as control measures for this PM2.5 Plan. These adopted regulations will dramatically reduce directly emitted PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 precursors (NOx and SOx) as they are fully implemented over the next few years, greatly contributing to the Valley's progress towards the 2006 PM2.5

standard. Any new regulatory control measure commitment identified in the Plan, will be developed within its own public process and CEQA analysis.

The proposed Plan is not anticipated to impact 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.

Mitigation: None required.

Impacts on Humans (c)

Conclusion: The Project will not result in environmental impacts that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

Discussion: The 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 PM2.5 improves, substantial human health benefits would occur.

Mitigation: None required.

H. List of Attachments

I. INITIAL STUDY DISTRIBUTION LIST

59 cities within District Boundaries (Planning Directors)

Eight Counties within District Boundaries (Planning Directors)

Caltrans, District 6
P.O. Box 12616
Fresno, CA 93779

California Department of Fish and Game
San Joaquin Valley Region
1234 East Shaw Avenue
Fresno, CA 93726

Kern Council of Governments
1401 19th Street, Suite 300
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Kings County Association of Governments
1400 W. Lacey Blvd.
Hanford, CA 93230

Tulare County Association of Governments
210 N. Church Street, Suite B
Visalia, CA 93291

Merced County Association of Governments
369 West 18th Street
Merced, CA 95340

Council of Fresno County Governments
2035 Tulare Street, Suite 201
Fresno, CA 93721

San Joaquin Council of Governments
555 E. Weber Ave
Stockton, CA 95202

Madera County Transportation Commission
2001 Howard Road, Suite 201
Madera, CA 93637
Regional Water Quality Control Board

Fresno Office
1685 "E" Street
Fresno, CA 93706

Stanislaus Council of Governments
1111 "I" Street, Suite 308
Modesto, CA 95354