SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY UNIFIED AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR RULE 9510 (INDIRECT SOURCE REVIEW (ISR)) AND RULE 3180 (ADMINISTRATIVE FEES FOR AIR IMPACT ASSESSMENT APPLICATIONS)

A. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Project Title:

Rule 9510 (indirect Source Review (ISR)) and Rule 3180 (Administrative Fees for Air Impact Assessment Applications)

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:

CEQA
Mr. Hector R. Guerra
Senior Air Quality Planner
(559) 230-5820

RULE
Ms. Chrystal Meier
Air Quality Specialist
(559) 230-5800

4. Project Location:

Rules 9510 and 3180 would apply 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 Figure 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
Figure 1
San Joaquin Valley Air Basin Boundaries
6. Project Description:

A. Introduction

The San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (District) adopted its 2003 PM10 Plan on June 19, 2003, which projects attainment of the NAAQS for PM10 at the earliest practicable date of December 31, 2010. As part of its PM10 attainment strategy, the District is required to reduce directly emitted PM10 and the PM10 precursor oxides of nitrogen (NOx). The District committed to reduce the PM10 and NOx emissions from indirect sources in the 2003 PM10 Plan and the Extreme Ozone Attainment Demonstration Plan, which could be achieved by on-site emission reduction and/or emission based fees that would be used to fund off-site emissions reduction projects. Both plans contained emissions reduction commitments from growth that were necessary to demonstrate attainment. Appendix B of the Draft Staff Report for Rules 9510 and 3180 contains an estimate of total emissions and emissions reductions expected from new development projects by 2010, which are 5.8 tons per day of NOx and 5.7 tons per day of PM10.

Emissions reductions from Rule 9510 are also important for attaining state and federal ozone standards. As an extreme nonattainment area, the SJVAB is required by the Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) to attain the NAAQS for ozone by November 15, 2010. In order to achieve attainment by 2010, the Extreme Ozone Attainment Demonstration Plan contained commitments to reduce a precursor of ozone, NOx. These commitments included reductions from indirect sources. By 2007, the District will be required to prepare a plan to comply with the new more stringent federal 8-hour ozone standard that is expected to require additional reductions. Additionally, the California Clean Air Act (CCAA) requires the District to adopt all feasible control measures to attain the California ambient air quality standards.

District Authority

One of the primary provisions of state law giving the District authority to regulate indirect source emissions is part of the California Clean Air Act legislation adopted in 1988. The provision, incorporated into Health and Safety Code, Section 40716, states that “a district may adopt and implement regulations to … reduce or mitigate emissions from indirect and areawide sources of air pollution.”

Indirect source mitigation programs are also consistent with ARB’s interpretation of the CCAA all feasible measures requirement:

“every feasible measure to mean that, at a minimum, a district consider regulations that have been successfully implemented elsewhere. They should also consider going beyond what has already been accomplished by evaluating new technologies and innovative approaches that may offer potential emission reductions. Further, districts should consider not only technological factors, but also social, environmental, economic (e.g., cost-effectiveness), and energy factors which prevail in
Health and Safety Code §42311(g) allows districts to adopt a schedule of fees on areawide or indirect sources which are regulated, but for which permits are not issued, to cover the costs of District programs related to this source. SB 709, Florez, was passed by the state legislature, was signed by Governor Gray Davis in 2003, and codified into the Health and Safety Code in §40604. This requires the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District to adopt, by regulation, a schedule of fees to be assessed on areawide or indirect sources of emissions.

**B. Project Description**

**Proposed Rule 9510**

The purpose of proposed Rule 9510 (hereinafter Rule 9510) is to reduce emissions of NOx and PM10 from new development projects. The rule applies to development projects that will seek to gain a discretionary approval for projects that, upon full build-out will include any one of the following: 50 residential units, 2,000 square feet of commercial space, 25,000 square feet of industrial space, 20,000 square feet of medical office space, 39,000 square feet of general office space, 9,000 square feet of educational space, 10,000 square feet of government space, 20,000 square feet of recreational space, or 9,000 square feet of uncategorized space. The rule also applies to transportation projects whose construction exhaust emissions will result in a total of two tons per year of NOx and PM10 combined. However, there are several sources that are exempt. These include, but are not limited to transportation projects that meet certain conditions, transit projects, reconstruction projects that result from a natural disaster, housing rehabilitation projects, certain low-income housing projects, almond hulling facilities, canneries, catalytic gas liquids processing, cotton ginning facilities, energy production plants, glass plants, natural gas production and processing, oil production and processing, product coating manufacturing, refineries, wastewater separation plants. An applicant also has the option to petition that their land-use be exempt. Also, development projects that have a mitigated operational baseline below two tons per year for NOx and PM10 shall be exempt from the off-site mitigation requirements of the rule. A developer has the option to provide as many emission reducing design features on-site as possible. If on-site emissions are not reduced by the amount specified in the rule, excess emissions will be subject to a District fee as specified in Rule 9510. Also, anti-circumvention language is included to prevent piecemealing of development projects.

Rule 9510 would direct the District to administer fees used to achieve emissions reductions that the fees were based on in a cost-effective manner. There are numerous emissions reduction projects available. Potential projects are as follows: projects currently qualifying for the District’s Heavy-Duty Engine Incentive Program including, alternative fuel low-emission school buses, transit buses, and other vehicles, diesel
engine retrofits and re-powers for trucks, PM efficient street sweepers powered by
natural gas, agricultural water pumping engine replacements with electric motors,
locomotive re-power/retrofits, electric forklifts, etc. Other potential projects include
gross polluter replacement, biomass subsidies, electric vehicle or lawn equipment
rebates, truck refrigeration unit plug-ins at distribution centers, woodstove
replacement/retirement, and video-teleconferencing systems. Potential PM10
reduction programs include paving or treating unpaved traffic surfaces and shoulders.
The funds will be managed by a grant-like program and allocated as applications are
received. If a sufficient amount of applications to fund projects are not received, the
District will consider a directive program that would be approved by the Governing
Board. The District recognizes the sensitivity of the geographic distribution of the funds.
Any emissions reduction project will provide a localized benefit to the area of fee origin.
Appendix E of the Draft Staff Report for Rules 9510 and 3180 contains more
information on emission reduction projects.

**Proposed Rule 3180**

The purpose of proposed Rule 3180 (hereinafter Rule 3180) is to recover the costs of
administering Rule 9510. The rule includes a non-refundable application filing fee to be
paid when an application is submitted to the District. Once an application and the
application fee are received, district staff will log the total staff hours spent on the
project. The application evaluation fee will comprise those hours at a weighted average
labor rate and subtract the application fee, so that only the cost of the actual hours
spent on the project will be recovered.

Rule 3180 also contains a fee equal to 4% of the off-site emission reduction fees to
recover the cost of administering off-site emission reduction projects. The 4% would be
payable when the off-site emission reduction fees are collected.

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

Rules 9510 and 3180 must be submitted to the California Air Resources Board which in
turn forwards the Rules to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for approval.

8. **Project Compatibility with Existing Zones and Plans:**

Adoption and implementation of Rules 9510 and 3180 fulfills the District’s commitments
contained in the District’s 2003 PM10 Plan as part of its PM10 attainment strategy to
reduce PM10 and NOx (a PM10 precursor) and the Extreme Ozone Attainment
Demonstration Plan strategy to reduce NOx.

The project does not conflict with any General Plan or zoning designations. Appendix G of
the Draft Staff Report for Rules 9510 and 3180 contains the District’s rule consistency
analysis.
9. **Name of Person Who Prepared Initial Study:**

Hector R. Guerra  
San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District  
1990 E. Gettysburg Ave.  
Fresno, CA 93726  
(559) 230-5820
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: _______________

Printed name: Hector R. Guerra
Title: Senior Air Quality Planner
D. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CHECKLIST

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I. AESTHETICS Would the proposal:
   a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?  
   b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?  
   c) Create light or glare?  

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?  

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 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/SOILS Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VIII. HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY Would the project:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IX. LAND USE/PLANNING
Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### X. MINERAL RESOURCES
Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### XI. NOISE
Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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/HOUSING** Would the project:

- 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? **✓**
- b) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? **✓**
- c) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)? **✓**
- d) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? **✓**
### 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? | | | √ |

### 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/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? | | | √ |
| 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? | | | |
San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District

Initial Study/Proposed Negative Declaration

Rules 9510 and 3180

Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact
---|---|---|---
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

I. a) & b): Rules 9510 and 3180 are not expected to adversely affect or change land use in the District. The rules will not require any changes in the physical environment that would obstruct any scenic vistas or views of interest to the public. The rules would not create aesthetically offensive sites visible to the public. No significant adverse aesthetic or recreation impacts are expected from the rules. [Sources: 1, 5]

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

II. a) - c): Adoption of Rules 9510 and 3180 would not lead to the conversion of prime or unique farmland to non-agricultural use. The rules will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or Williamson Act contract. [Sources: 1, 5]

III. AIR QUALITY

III. a) – e): Rules 9510 and 3180 will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Adoption and implementation of Rules 9510 and 3180 will not result in a violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Rules 9510 and 3180 will not 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). Rules 9510 and 3180 will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or result in the creation of objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Also, see discussion at section 6. Project Description, A. Introduction, regarding the District’s commitments to reduce PM10 and NOx emissions from indirect sources as specified in the 2003 PM10 Plan and the Extreme Ozone Attainment Demonstration Plan. The Draft Staff Report prepared for Rule 9510 contains an estimate of total emissions and emissions reductions expected from new development projects by 2010, which are 5.8 tons per day of NOx and 5.8 tons per day of PM10. [Sources 4 and 5]. The emission reductions expected from the rule result from reduced emissions at the project site through cleaner construction equipment, reduced energy consumption, lower motor vehicle trips from the development. Funds generated by the rule will be used to purchase air pollutant emission reductions from a wide variety of sources in the vicinity of the project site.
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

IV. a) – f): Rules 9510 and 3180 are not expected to adversely affect existing plant or animal species or communities, unique or endangered plant or animal species, or agricultural crops. Rule 9510 will not result in additional significant adverse impacts to biological resources. As the District does not have land use authority, only agencies with land use authority will determine the appropriateness of development sites. Any physical changes would occur at sites determined appropriate by agencies with land authority with or without the rules. Improvements in air quality expected from Rules 9510 and 3180 are expected to provide health benefits to plant and animal species, as well as to humans in the District. [Sources: 1, 5].

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

V. a) - d): No significant impacts to cultural resources are not expected because Rules 9510 and 3180 will not require the destruction of existing buildings or sites with prehistoric, historic, archaeological, religious, or ethnic significance. The proposed rules are, therefore, not anticipated to result in any activities or promote any programs, which could have a significant adverse impact on cultural resources within the District. [Sources: 1, 5].

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

There are no provisions in the rules 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. Adoption of the rules would not increase the exposure of people or property to geologic hazards, fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, seismic ground failure, seiche, tsunami or volcanic hazard. [Sources: 1, 2, 3, 5]

VII. HAZARD & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

VII. a) - h): Rules 9510 and 3180 will not create any significant hazard or hazardous materials. Rules 9510 and 3180 would not result in increased exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards or increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees. [Sources: 1, 5]

VIII. HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY

VIII. a) - i): Rules 9510 and 3180 will not have an adverse effect on hydrology or water quality. [Sources: 1, 5]
IX. LAND USE/PLANNING

IX. a) – c): Rules 9510 and 3180 would not 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. Rules 9510 and 3180 may result in enhanced design of land use patterns to encourage reduced reliance of motor vehicles and more efficient movement of motor vehicles. These are voluntary measures that the applicant includes in the project and are subject to a discretionary approval by a land use agency.

There are no provisions in the Rules 9510 and 3180 that would affect land use plans, policies, or regulations. However, rule compliance reduces air quality impacts of land use plans. It is also expected that Rules 9510 and 3180 will not affect infrastructure development or require changes to existing zone designations. Land use and other planning considerations are determined by local governments and no land use or planning requirements would be altered by adopting Rules 9510 and 3180. The Socioeconomic Impact Analysis for Rules 9510 and 3180 concluded that housing affordability would not be significantly affected thereby resulting in no changes to affordable housing strategies and housing distribution patterns. [Sources: 1, 5]

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

X. a), b): Adoption of Rules 9510 and 3180 would not affect the availability of any mineral resource. There are no provisions in Rules 9510 and 3180 that would either conflict with adopted energy conservation plans nor result in the use of non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner nor result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State. [Sources: 1, 5]

XI. NOISE

XI. a) - f): Rules 9510 and 3180 adoption will not have an adverse impact on noise. There are no components of the rules that would substantially increase ambient noise levels, either intermittently or permanently. [Sources: 1 and 5]

XII. POPULATION/HOUSING

XII. a) – c): Rules 9510 and 3180 are not anticipated to result in changes in population densities or induce significant growth in population. However, as noted in IX LAND USE/PLANNING, above, the proposed rule may result in enhanced design of land use patterns to encourage reduced reliance of motor vehicles and more efficient movement
of motor vehicles. One possible design enhancement could be higher residential densities as such densities reduce vehicle miles traveled thereby resulting in a clean air benefit. Because of the region's available workforce, any demand for new employees can be accommodated from the local region, so no substantial population displacement is anticipated. Therefore, construction of replacement housing elsewhere in the District is not anticipated. Also, as noted in IX. LAND USE/PLANNING, the Socioeconomic Impact Analysis for Rules 9510 and 3180 concluded that housing affordability would not be significantly affected thereby resulting in no changes to affordable housing strategies and housing distribution patterns. [Sources: 1 and 5]

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

XIII. a) - d): Proposed Rules 9510 and 3180 would not result in impacts to fire and police protection services. Existing schools and park or other recreational facilities would not be impacted by the proposed rules. Adopting the proposed rules is not anticipated to create significant adverse public service impacts. [Sources: 1 and 5]

XIV. RECREATION

XIV. a) & b): Proposed Rules 9510 and 3180 would not adversely affect recreational facilities or resources in the District. These conclusions are based on the fact that any physical changes would occur at existing agricultural, industrial, or commercial sites and roads supporting these sites with or without the rules. [Sources: 1 and 5]

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

XV. a) - g): Proposed Rules 9510 and 3180 would not result in increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion upon public paved roads, hazards to safety from design features (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) nor will the rule conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks). Also, see discussions at IX. LAND USE/PLANNING and XII. POPULATION/HOUSING [Sources: 1, 5]

XVI. UTILITIES/SERVICE SYSTEMS

XVI. a) - f): There are no provisions in proposed Rules 9510 and 3180 that would affect existing communication systems, sewer or septic tanks, or regional water treatment or distribution facilities.

Proposed Rules 9510 and 3180 would not result in any demand for new utilities or service systems, or result in any substantial demand on existing sources. See Item
VIII. HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY for a discussion of potential impacts on water and public water supplies. [Source: 5]

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

XVIII. a) – c): This project does not 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.

This project does not have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals. Neither does this project have impacts which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. This project will have no potential environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Based upon consideration of the information provided in the comments to the Environmental Checklist and other analyses performed for this project, it does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment or to interfere with either short-term or long-term environmental goals. There will not be any significant cumulative impacts. Finally, the project will not cause any direct or indirect substantial adverse effects on human beings. [Sources 1 and 5]
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