

BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
939 Ellis Street
San Francisco, CA 94109

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Adopted October 24, 2001

PROJECT TITLE

Revised San Francisco Bay Area 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan

PROJECT SPONSORS

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Association of Bay Area Governments

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Plan identifies a set of control measures to be implemented throughout the region to reduce air pollutant emissions in order to attain the national 1-hour ozone standard. The Plan includes stationary source control measures, transportation control measures and a mobile source control measure.

PROJECT LOCATION

The Plan applies within the area covered by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. This area includes all of seven counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara) and portions of two others (southwestern Solano and southern Sonoma).

DETERMINATION

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code section 21000 *et seq*), the Bay Area Air Quality Management District is the Lead Agency for the described project. District staff have prepared an Initial Study (attached), and, on the basis of the study, have determined that the project will not have significant adverse impacts on the environment.

REVIEW PERIOD/ADOPTION

Written comments on the draft Negative Declaration were accepted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District from September 17, 2001 through October 17, 2001. The BAAQMD Board of Directors adopted the Negative Declaration at a public hearing on October 24, 2001.

If you have any questions about the project or the Negative Declaration, contact Henry Hilken, Senior Environmental Planner, at (415) 749-4642.

BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
939 Ellis Street
San Francisco, CA 94109

CEQA INITIAL STUDY

INTRODUCTION

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD or District), the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) have prepared the Revised 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan (2001 Plan). The purpose of the 2001 Plan is to identify a set of control measures that will be implemented throughout the region in order to attain the national 1-hour ozone standard. The District, MTC and ABAG previously adopted a 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan in July 2001, but based on direction from the California Air Resources Board and the U.S. EPA, the agencies have prepared the Revised Plan. While the 2001 Plan is expected to benefit the environment and public health, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that the District, MTC and ABAG consider whether the Plan could have adverse environmental impacts prior to taking action on the Plan. (The District is the Lead Agency for the project, and MTC and ABAG are Responsible Agencies.) This Initial Study summarizes the agencies' evaluation of the Revised Plan's potential to have environmental impacts.

Project

Revised San Francisco Bay Area 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan for the 1-Hour National Ozone Standard

Lead Agency

Bay Area Air Quality Management District
939 Ellis Street
San Francisco, CA 94109

Contact Person

Henry Hilken, (415) 749-4642, hhilken@baaqmd.gov

Project Location

This Plan applies within the area covered by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The District includes all of seven counties - Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Napa - and portions of two others - southwestern Solano and southern Sonoma.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Background

This Plan outlines a strategy to attain the 1-hour national ozone standard in the San Francisco Bay Area. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) redesignated the Bay Area in attainment of the 1-hour national ozone standard in 1995. However, hot stagnant weather in the summers of 1995 and 1996 led to exceedances of the 1-hour standard, ultimately leading EPA in 1998 to redesignate the region back into nonattainment status. Accordingly, the three co-lead agencies in June 1999 adopted the 1999 Bay Area Ozone Attainment Plan (1999 Plan) which identified a set of control measures intended to reduce air pollutant emissions sufficiently to bring the region back into attainment of the national standard. This 2001 Plan amends and supplements the 1999 Plan.

Ozone is a regional air pollution problem because ozone is not emitted directly by pollution sources. Ozone is instead formed in the lower atmosphere through complex chemical reactions between hydrocarbons (also referred to as reactive organic gases, ROG, or volatile organic compounds, VOC) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) in the presence of sunlight. Emissions of hydrocarbons and NO_x throughout the Bay Area contribute to these reactions. Efforts to reduce ambient ozone concentrations focus on reducing emissions of these precursor pollutants.

High concentrations of ozone in the lower atmosphere can irritate the eyes and constrict the airways, as well as aggravate existing respiratory problems such as asthma, bronchitis and emphysema. Long term exposure can permanently damage lung tissue. Ozone also damages trees, agricultural crops and other plants, and accelerates deterioration of rubber, plastics, fabrics, paints and finishes. EPA has set national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for ozone to define the level considered safe for human health.

EPA's 1998 redesignation, published in the Federal Register (63 Fed. Reg. 37258; July 10, 1998), required the region to prepare a plan with three principal elements: 1) a 1995 emission inventory for VOC and NO_x; 2) an assessment of the reductions in these precursors needed to attain the national standard by 2000 ("attainment assessment"), and; 3) a control strategy of adopted regulations and/or control measures, with enforceable commitments to adopt and implement the control measures by specified dates, sufficient to meet reasonable further progress and attain the 1-hour NAAQS expeditiously but no later than November 15, 2000. The attainment assessment estimated the amount by which VOC and NO_x emissions must be reduced between 1995 and 2000 in order to meet the national 1-hour ozone standard of 0.12 parts per million, while the control strategy described how these reductions would be achieved.

The 1999 Plan included these three elements. The 1999 Plan's control strategy included 11 new control measures. Although the 11 control measures were adopted, implemented and achieved emission reductions, the region continued to experience ozone exceedances in 1999 and 2000.

In a Federal Register notice (66 Fed. Reg. 17379, March 30, 2001), EPA proposed to make a formal finding that the Bay Area failed to attain the national 1-hour ozone standard within the prescribed timeframe. EPA's March 30, 2001 Federal Register notice proposed partial approval and partial disapproval of the

1999 Plan. EPA finalized the March notice on August 28, 2001. EPA's August 28, 2001 action approved the following components of the 1999 Plan:

- Baseline (1995) emission inventory
- Reasonable further progress demonstration
- Commitment to achieve additional emission reductions through implementation of new control measures
- Contingency measures
- Deletion of four current transportation control measures (TCMs 6, 11, 12, and 16)

EPA's August 28, 2001 action disapproved the following components of the 1999 Plan:

- Attainment assessment
- Transportation emissions budget
- Reasonably available control measure demonstration

The District, MTC and ABAG prepared a Proposed Final 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan to respond to EPA's March 30, 2001 Federal Register notice and approved the Plan on July 18, 2001. The California Air Resources Board (ARB) did not take action on the Plan at a July 26, 2001 hearing, preferring to consider adoption of the Plan after the regional agencies had conducted additional community meetings. Following the community meetings, the District, MTC and ABAG prepared a Revised 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan (September 2001).

B. Plan Overview

The (Revised) 2001 Plan revises the three elements of the 1999 Plan that EPA disapproved on August 28, 2001: the attainment assessment, the transportation emissions budget and the reasonably available control measure demonstration. To address requirements that are triggered by a finding of failure to attain the national 1-hour ozone standard, this 2001 Plan also includes a new emissions inventory and additional control measures. This Plan also includes contingency measures in the event the Bay Area does not attain the standard by 2006.

The region will continue to benefit from regulations that have already been adopted. State and national regulations on motor vehicles and other mobile sources, combined with the turnover of the region's vehicle fleet, will result in significant reductions in ozone precursor emissions. ARB regulations on consumer products and other area sources also will provide emissions reductions. And ongoing implementation of District regulations on stationary sources will continue to reduce emissions as well. In order to supplement these emission reductions and further improve the likelihood of attainment by 2006, this 2001 Plan proposes 13 additional control measures: seven additional stationary source control measures, to be implemented by the District, one additional mobile source control measure, to be implemented by the Bureau of Automotive Repair, and five additional TCMs, to be implemented by MTC.

The 2001 Plan also proposes eleven additional measures for further study, to determine whether significant additional emission reductions could be achieved and whether implementation is feasible. Currently, these measures are not included in the 2001 Plan control strategy. If further study shows that any of these eleven measures may be feasible and yield significant emission

reductions, they may be added to the control strategy in subsequent Plan revisions.

In response to comments from EPA, the Plan also includes a commitment to achieve additional emission reductions and revise the Plan prior to the 2006 attainment date. The District, MTC and ABAG are committed to conduct a midcourse review of the Plan in 2003. This midcourse review will include analysis of a comprehensive modeling study currently underway (Central California Ozone Study) and other technical data. The Plan currently indicates that additional reductions of 26 tons per day of VOCs will be needed. That estimate is subject to change depending on the findings of the midcourse review. Following the midcourse review in 2003, the Plan will be revised in 2004 to incorporate the results of the midcourse review and any additional control measures needed to demonstrate attainment. Currently, no reasonably available control measures have been identified to achieve this magnitude of additional emission reductions, so any assessment at this time of potential environmental impacts of such unspecified control measures would be highly speculative. When the Plan is revised in 2004, it will undergo environmental analysis as required by CEQA.

C. Proposed Control Measure Descriptions

This section briefly describes each proposed control measure. Refer to the proposed 2001 Plan for additional detail on proposed control measures.

Stationary Source Control Measures

SS 11 Improved Architectural Coatings Rule

Various types of architectural coatings (paints, varnishes, lacquers, industrial maintenance coatings) emit VOCs as they evaporate. District Regulation 8, Rule 3 limits the VOC content of various architectural coatings. Other California air districts also regulate architectural coatings. From 1998 – 2000, ARB, with local air district and industry representation, reviewed architectural coatings and currently applicable VOC limits in order to develop a Suggested Control Measure (SCM) to provide guidance to districts throughout the state. ARB adopted the SCM in June 2000. The SCM reduces allowable VOC content in various categories of architectural coatings. Control measure SS 11 proposes to adopt the SCM into District Regulation 8-3.

SS 12 Improved Storage of Organic Liquids Rule

Petroleum refineries, bulk distribution facilities, chemical plants and other facilities store organic liquids in large storage tanks. These tanks have either fixed roofs or floating roofs. VOC emissions occur as a result of: “breathing losses” due to changes in temperature and barometric pressure; “working losses” associated with emptying and filling tanks, and; fugitive leaks at seals and fittings. District Regulation 8, Rule 5 limits emissions from organic liquid storage tanks. Control measure SS 12 would make these requirements more stringent by requiring better seals and requiring more frequent inspection of seals and fittings.

SS 13 Surface Preparation and Cleanup Standards for Metal Parts Coating

The manufacture of large appliances and miscellaneous metal parts often includes the application of paints, sealers, and other coatings, which result in VOC emissions as these coatings evaporate. District Regulation 8, Rules 14 and 19 limit the VOC content of metal parts coatings. Neither rule includes VOC limits for solvents used in surface preparation and cleanup. Control measure SS 13 proposes to amend Rules 8-14 and 8-19 to include VOC limits for surface preparation and cleanup solvents.

SS 14 Aqueous Solvents

Many commercial and manufacturing facilities clean metal and non-metal surfaces with solvents in order to remove oil, grease, grit, metal chips and other contaminants. VOC emissions occur as these solvents evaporate. District Regulation 8, Rule 16 limits emissions from solvent cleaning operations, and includes exemptions for certain specialized facilities. Control measure SS 14 would remove exemptions for certain specialized facilities. It is expected that most affected facilities would comply by using aqueous (water-based) solvents.

SS 15 Petroleum Refinery Flare Monitoring

Petroleum refineries collect and separate liquid and gaseous discharges from various process units. Recovered gases are generally sent to the fuel gas system for use in refinery combustion, but the gases are sometimes combusted in flares. Refinery flares are designed to handle large fluctuations in the flow rate and hydrocarbon content of gases. Determining emissions from refinery flares has been very difficult due to the inability to accurately determine the composition and quantity of the gases sent to the flare. New technologies, such as ultrasonic flow monitors, allow more accurate emissions estimates. This control measure would require flare monitoring at Bay Area refineries.

SS 16 Low Emission Refinery Valves

Fugitive emissions of VOCs occur at refineries and chemical plants as a result of leaks at valves, flanges and other fittings. The District currently regulates fugitive emissions at refineries and chemical plants. Valves at new refinery sources must be equipped with best available control technology (BACT), but replacements of existing refinery valves are exempt from BACT requirements. This control measure would require that replacement valves meet BACT requirements or be "leakless" valves.

SS 17 Improved Process Vessel Depressurization Rule

Refinery process vessels are sometimes shut down and depressurized for repair and maintenance. Current District regulations require that during vessel depressurization, emissions be abated to a certain level before they may be vented to the atmosphere. This control measure would require that emissions be abated to a lower level.

Mobile Source Control Measure

MS 1 Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program: Opt-in Request for Leak Inspection and Evaporative System Test

California's Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance (I&M) Program, "Smog Check", has varying test requirements by geographic area. The Bay Area is required to adopt a "Basic" I&M Program, while other areas (e.g., Sacramento and San Joaquin Valley cities) must implement an "Enhanced" I&M Program. The Bureau of Automotive Repair (BAR) is currently examining additional tests to augment the I&M Program. It has not yet been determined whether the new tests will apply to all I&M areas. Several new proposed tests appear especially promising for reducing VOC emissions: 1) a visual inspection test for liquid leaks, 2) a test to determine whether the fuel tank's evaporative control system is functioning properly, 3) stricter testing standards (emission cutpoints for passing), and 4) other VOC reduction elements. This control measure provides that once these program elements are adopted by BAR, the District would request that BAR implement these program elements in the Bay Area.

Transportation Control Measures

TCM A Regional Express Bus Program

This program would consist of the purchase of approximately 90 low emission buses to operate regional express bus services. The buses will meet all applicable ARB standards and will include particulate traps or filters. Service and routes have been selected by MTC, but the buses have not yet been ordered. MTC will provide \$40 million for bus acquisition. Implementation would begin in FY2003 with initial operations.

TCM B Bicycle/Pedestrian Program

This measure would commit \$15 million in Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 funding to fund high priority projects in countywide plans. Specific projects have not yet been determined, but will likely consist primarily of bicycle routes, lanes and paths, storage facilities such as bicycle racks and lockers, and related pedestrian improvements.

TCM C Transportation for Livable Communities Program

MTC's Transportation for Livable Communities Program provides planning grants, technical assistance, and capital grants to assist cities and nonprofit agencies to link transportation projects with community plans. Examples of eligible projects include streetscape improvements, bicycle facilities, pedestrian plazas and enhancements at transit villages. This measure assumes continuation of the program between FY2004 and FY2006 at \$9 million per year.

TCM D Expansion of Freeway Service Patrol

The Freeway Service Patrol Program operates tow trucks on Bay Area freeways in order to reduce incident-related congestion by promptly assisting disabled vehicles. The program currently operates 60 trucks on 362 lane miles. This TCM consists of operation of an additional 55 lane miles of new roving patrols (beginning July 2001) to clear incidents and reduce delays during peak periods. Tow trucks used in this service will be new trucks meeting all applicable ARB standards.

TCM E Transit Access to Airports

The BART extension to San Francisco International Airport (SFO) is currently under construction, with completion and operation expected in FY2003. The extension will reduce auto trips to/from SFO by airport employees and air passengers. The emission reductions from reduced air passenger trips are not accounted for in MTC's model nor in the Plan's baseline emissions. This TCM takes credit for these emission reductions for reduced air passenger auto trips.

Potential environmental impacts associated with the BART to SFO extension were analyzed in an environmental impact report certified by the BART Board of Directors in 1992 (with a supplemental EIR approved in June 1996). The purpose of this TCM is to account for emission reductions associated with air passenger trips taken on this extension. The BART to SFO extension will be implemented regardless of any action taken on this Plan. Thus, any potential adverse environmental impacts associated with the extension's construction and operation are beyond the scope of this initial study.

D. Previous and Continuing Environmental Analysis

EPA's 1998 redesignation requirements and 2001 notice of partial Plan disapproval are superimposed onto a comprehensive, ongoing program to reduce ambient ozone levels in the Bay Area. This 2001 Plan is being prepared in addition to the District's ongoing efforts to attain the more stringent State 1-hour ozone standard of 0.09 parts per million. As required by State law, the District has adopted a plan to attain the State 1-hour ozone standard by the earliest practicable date. The District's first such "state" ozone plan was the Bay Area 1991 Clean Air Plan (1991 CAP). The 1991 CAP was subsequently updated in 1994, 1997 and 2000. The 2000 CAP is the current plan for attaining the state ozone standard. To address potential environmental impacts of the 1991 CAP, the District Board of Directors in 1991 certified a program environmental impact report for that plan (1991 CAP EIR). In 1994, 1997 and 2000, the Board approved EIR Addenda which examined potential environmental effects of those respective plans. In June 1999 the Board approved a Negative Declaration for the 1999 Plan (for the national ozone standard).

CEQA requires analysis of potential environmental impacts of the control measures in the Plan. In general, for stationary source measures that require the District to adopt or amend a rule, potential environmental impacts are examined at both the plan level and during rule development. As previously noted, the District prepared and certified an EIR in 1991 and EIR addenda in 1994, 1997 and 2000 that examined potential environmental impacts of all the control measures proposed in the respective (State) plans, and in 1999 approved

a Negative Declaration for the 1999 Plan. Subsequent to approving a plan, each time the District adopts or amends a rule pursuant to a control measure proposed in a plan, the District analyzes potential environmental effects of the specific rule requirements in a CEQA document included as part of the rule development staff report.

Potential environmental impacts of TCMs are analyzed in the 1991 CAP EIR. In addition, MTC prepares a program EIR for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP program EIR, including the EIR currently being prepared for the 2001 RTP, analyzes potential environmental impacts of the transportation projects and programs proposed in the RTP, including the programs proposed as TCMs in this 2001 Plan.

Two of the proposed control measures – TCMs B and C – will result in the construction of local bicycle and pedestrian projects such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian plazas and streetscape improvements. Most of these projects are small in scale and local in scope. The goals of such projects generally are to improve access and safety for pedestrians and bicyclists, and/or to enhance visual appearance and community vitality. Some of these projects would be exempt from environmental review, while others would be subject to CEQA analysis by an implementing agency, usually a city or county. As part of the transportation programming process, MTC and Caltrans require that as specific projects are proposed for funding, project sponsors must comply with environmental review processes in CEQA and NEPA. As noted in the Plan's control measure descriptions, when implementing TCMs B and C MTC will only fund projects that are exempt from CEQA, have no significant adverse environmental impacts or have adequately mitigated any significant adverse environmental impacts.

Environmental Setting

The EPA, in its 1998 redesignation notice, deemed the San Francisco Bay Area to be an "unclassified" nonattainment area for the national 1-hour ozone standard. The San Francisco Bay Area is a "serious" nonattainment area for the State 1-hour ozone standard. The environmental setting for this Plan is fully described in the 1991 CAP (program) EIR as updated by the 1994, 1997 and 2000 addenda to that EIR. These documents are incorporated by reference and are available for review at the District offices, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, California 94109.

The Bay Area's environmental setting, with respect to air quality, has not changed significantly since 1991. Despite hot weather and high ozone levels of 1995, 1996 and 1998, monitoring data show a general downward trend in ozone concentrations and population exposure since the late 1980's. Peak ozone concentrations have declined 1.4 percent per year, on average, since the 1986-88 base period. Results vary by geographic location and time interval, due to the complexity of source patterns and weather conditions. Since 1986, population exposure to ozone, as a weighted average for the region, has been reduced by 68 percent. The region recorded 3 excesses of the national ozone standard and 20 excesses of the State standard in 1999, and 3 excesses of the national standard and 12 excesses of the State standard in 2000. The region's air quality conditions continue to show generally clean air, with occasional exceedances of the national ozone standard, somewhat more frequent exceedances of the more

stringent State ozone standard, and overall improvement with year-to-year fluctuations due mainly to varying meteorology.

With respect to the regulatory context, this 2001 Plan represents a continuation of the District's ongoing effort to reduce emissions of ozone precursors from stationary, area and mobile sources in order to attain health-based State and federal ambient air quality standards for ozone, as previously identified in the following regional plans: 1982 Bay Area Air Quality Plan; 1990 Adoption of SIP Contingency Measures; 1993 Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan for the National Ozone Standard; 1991 (State) Clean Air Plan; 1994 (State) Clean Air Plan; 1997 (State) Clean Air Plan; 1999 Bay Area Ozone Attainment Plan, and; 2000 (State) Clean Air Plan.

Other Approvals Required

Following adoption by the co-lead planning agencies - BAAQMD, ABAG and MTC – the 2001 Plan will be submitted to ARB and US EPA for review and, if approved, inclusion in California's State Implementation Plan (SIP).

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find 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 revisions in the project have been made by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

- I find the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

- I find 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, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (1) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures from the EIR that are imposed upon the proposed project.

[name]
[title]

Date

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CHECKLIST

(Note: All answers are explained on attached sheets.)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Aesthetics. Would the proposal:				
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_____
2. Agriculture Resources. Would the proposal:				
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. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____
3. Air Quality. Would the proposal:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
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)?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

4. Biological Resources. Would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, 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?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
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?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
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?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____

5. Cultural Resources. Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

6. Geologic and Soils. Would the project:

a. Expose people or structure to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of 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 the Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42)	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
iv. Landslides?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
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?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
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?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project:

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
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?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
c. Emit hazardous materials or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
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?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
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?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
g. Impair the implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
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?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
8. Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net reduction 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)?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
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?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
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?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
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?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
9. Land Use and Planning. Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____

10. Mineral Resources. Would the project:

a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
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?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

11. Noise. Would the project result in:

a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
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?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

12. Population and Housing. Would the project:

a. Induce substantial 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)?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

13. Public Services. For any of the following public services, would the project require the construction of new or physically-altered governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives, thereby producing significant environmental impacts:

a. Fire protection?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
b. Police protection?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
c. Schools?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
d. Parks?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
e. Other public facilities?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

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

14. 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? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| 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? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |

15. Transportation and 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)? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ |
| b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| c. Produce a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersection) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| e. Result in inadequate emergency access? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ |
| f. Result in inadequate parking capacity? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ |
| g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |

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

16. Utilities and Service Systems. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|--------------|--------------|
| a. Exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ |
| 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? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| 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? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ |
| d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| 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? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |

17. Mandatory Findings of Significance.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	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?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
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.)	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Revised San Francisco Bay Area 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan for the 1-Hour National Ozone Standard

Introduction

This section of the Initial Study explains the reasons for checking the particular items checked in the checklist. Explanations are provided both for those items involving some potential impact and those for which no impact is anticipated.

Background

The proposed Plan that is the subject of this Initial Study consists of a set of control measures intended to reduce emissions of volatile organic compounds from stationary, area and mobile sources in order to attain the national 1-hour ozone standard.

1. Aesthetics

Implementation of some of the proposed stationary source control measures may in some cases result in very minor modifications at existing industrial and commercial facilities. Implementation of TCM B and TCM C will result in the construction of local bicycle and pedestrian projects such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian plazas and streetscape improvements. In many cases, a principal goal of these projects will be to enhance the appearance and safety of the project area for pedestrians and bicyclists. These minor modifications and bike/ped projects would not have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas, scenic resources, or existing visual character, nor create new sources of light and glare. As noted in the Plan's control measure descriptions, when implementing TCMs B and C MTC will only fund projects that are exempt from CEQA, have no significant adverse environmental impacts or have adequately mitigated any significant adverse environmental impacts.

2. Agriculture Resources

Implementation of some of the proposed stationary source control measures may in some cases result in very minor modifications at existing industrial and commercial facilities. Implementation of TCM B and TCM C will result in the construction of local bicycle and pedestrian projects such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian plazas and streetscape improvements. These minor modifications and bike/ped projects will not cause prime farmlands to be converted to nonagricultural use, lead to conflicts with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts, nor lead to other changes in the existing environment resulting in conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use. As noted in the Plan's control

measure descriptions, when implementing TCMs B and C MTC will only fund projects that are exempt from CEQA, have no significant adverse environmental impacts or have adequately mitigated any significant adverse environmental impacts.

3. Air Quality

The purpose of the 2001 Plan is to improve air quality conditions in the San Francisco Bay Area. Implementation of the 2001 Plan control measures will reduce emissions of ozone precursors in the region, contributing to improved air quality conditions in the San Francisco Bay Area as well as downwind regions. Some of the control measures will also reduce other air pollutants, including toxic air contaminants. Implementation of the 2001 Plan will benefit air quality and public health.

Implementation of control measures SS11, SS13 and SS 14 will likely result in a lowering of allowable VOC content of certain surface preparation and cleanup agents and specialty coatings. In order to meet the lower VOC limits, manufacturers may reformulate applicable coatings, substituting regulated solvents with non-precursor, or “exempt”, solvents. Some exempt solvents may contribute to depletion of stratospheric ozone and/or contribute to global warming. Some exempt solvents also may be toxic air contaminants.

This impact was discussed in the 1991 CAP EIR. In 1991 the BAAQMD Board of Directors adopted a Stratospheric Ozone Policy for the District. This Policy dictates that whenever the BAAQMD adopts or amends a rule, staff will examine the rule’s provisions for exempt solvents to assure that the exemption(s) will not promote the use of ozone depleting substances or toxic air contaminants. Though not specifically included in the Policy, staff also reviews exemptions to eliminate solvents that contribute to global warming. As noted in the Plan’s control measure descriptions, this policy will be followed during rule development for SS11, SS13 and SS14. Additionally, there are other alternatives to the use of exempt solvents that manufacturers may use to achieve lower VOC content in coatings. These alternatives include reactive diluents, in which organic solvents chemically react to become part of the finished coating, waterborne coatings, ultraviolet coatings, and powder coatings. Given the BAAQMD’s Stratospheric Ozone Policy and the availability of alternatives to exempt solvents, implementation of SS11, SS13 and SS14 is not expected to result in significant impacts with respect to stratospheric ozone depletion, global warming or air toxics.

Implementation of SS11 will likely result in a lowering of allowable VOC content in certain architectural coatings. During previous rule development processes, coatings manufacturers have suggested that lower VOC coatings do not perform

as well as currently allowed coatings and that such a requirement would result in a net negative impact on air quality. The reasons include the following: 1) lower VOC solvent-based coatings are very viscous and produce a thick film, resulting in higher VOC emissions per unit of area covered; 2) because the lower VOC solvent-based coatings are more viscous, painters often add solvent to thin the paint and make it easier to handle, thus increasing VOC emissions back to or even above the previous formulations; 3) waterborne topcoats do not adhere as well as solvent-borne topcoats, and thus additional priming and more coats are needed; 4) waterborne topcoats may not cover as well as solvent-based topcoats, thus requiring more coats to achieve acceptable appearance; 5) lower VOC solvent-based coatings, high-solids solvent-based enamels and waterborne coatings are susceptible to damage and discoloring, thus requiring more repair and touch-up; 6) because low VOC solvent-based coatings and waterborne coatings are less durable and more difficult to apply, consumers and contractors will substitute with other categories of coatings with higher allowable VOC content; 8) waterborne coatings contain solvents that are more reactive than the solvents in solvent-based coatings.

Coatings manufacturers have been raising these issues for several years, and based on these arguments have challenged architectural coatings rules proposed by the BAAQMD and other air districts including the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD), as well as ARB's Suggested Control Measure for Architectural Coatings. These issues have received extensive analysis, most recently in ARB's Final Program Environmental Impact Report – Suggested Control Measure for Architectural Coatings, June 2000. Based on extensive research and analysis, including review of South Coast AQMD field studies, ARB concluded that the evidence does not support the manufacturers' contentions. The evidence demonstrates that the Suggested Control Measure (SCM) will result in beneficial air quality impacts. As noted in the project description, the BAAQMD's architectural coatings rule revision will follow ARB's (statewide) SCM. Therefore, while the specific requirements of the BAAQMD's architectural coatings rule revision are subject to the rule development process, there is no substantive evidence that the controls envisioned in control measure SS11 would have an adverse impact on air quality. ARB's Final Program EIR for the Architectural Coatings SCM is incorporated by reference.

ARB also analyzed potential odor impacts from use of coatings containing substitute, complying solvents such as acetone. Because acetone and other likely substitute solvents have equivalent or higher odor thresholds (i.e., harder to detect) than currently allowable solvents, no adverse odor impacts from SS11 are expected.

Implementation of SS17 will require the use of abatement equipment to control VOC emissions at affected facilities. The most likely control technology involves venting VOCs to a thermal oxidizer, or afterburner. Afterburners incinerate VOCs and thus emit NO_x, carbon monoxide (CO) and other combustion

products. Depressurization of refinery process vessels occurs infrequently. The incremental increase in emissions of NO_x, CO and other combustion products that would result from implementation of SS17 would be very small. Also, afterburners are subject to District regulations and permit requirements in order to minimize combustion emissions. Compliance with District regulations and permit conditions regarding these pollution control devices will reduce this impact to a level of insignificance.

Implementation of TCM A will increase express bus service in major commute corridors throughout the region. These will be new (2001 and later) diesel buses operating in compliance with the most recent ARB emission standards, and thus TCM A will result in regional emissions of precursor pollutants and diesel exhaust. ARB has identified diesel particulate exhaust as a toxic air contaminant.

To maximize the cost effectiveness of the Regional Express Bus Program, MTC has worked with transit operators to select routes with the highest potential ridership. While the buses will emit criteria air pollutants, these emissions will be more than offset by the reduced (auto) emissions resulting from commuters shifting from autos to express buses. The emission reduction calculations for this TCM account for the increased bus emissions *and* reduced auto emissions, and indicate that the program will result in a net *reduction* in ROG and NO_x emissions. Emissions of other criteria pollutants such as carbon monoxide and fine particulate matter are also expected to be more than offset by reduced auto emissions. Thus, TCM A is expected to have a beneficial impact with respect to criteria air pollutants.

ARB has adopted and is implementing a multi-faceted Diesel Risk Reduction Program. This program includes numerous measures to reduce diesel exhaust health risks from a variety of on-road and off-road mobile sources and stationary equipment. ARB requirements include the following: stringent particulate matter emission standards for new urban diesel buses (0.05 grams per brake horsepower hour currently; 0.01 grams per brake horsepower hour as of 1/1/03); particulate traps required on all new urban diesel buses as of 1/1/03; stringent fuel standards for all transit districts using diesel fuel (ultra low sulfur diesel fuel as of 7/1/02). All buses used to implement TCM A would be new buses and thus would be subject to these requirements. Additionally, all buses used to implement TCM A will be equipped with particulate traps or filters, further reducing diesel particulate emissions. Also, MTC has proposed in the 2001 Plan a "further study" measure which would analyze the potential for accelerating the retrofit of (other) urban and suburban diesel buses throughout the Bay Area with particulate traps to achieve earlier compliance with ARB standards. Because of the stringent ARB requirements and the provision of particulate traps or filters, and because the express bus service will be distributed throughout the region, implementation of TCM A is not expected to have any significant adverse impact with respect to diesel exhaust.

Implementation of TCM D will increase travel by Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) vehicles (tow trucks and pick-ups). These will be new gasoline or diesel trucks operating in compliance with the most recent ARB standards. Thus, TCM D will result in regional emissions of precursor pollutants and diesel particulate exhaust.

While the FSP vehicles will emit criteria air pollutants, these emissions will be more than offset by reduced auto emissions resulting from the swift clearing of incident-related congestion. The emission reduction calculations for this TCM account for the increased FSP truck emissions *and* reduced auto emissions, and indicate that the program will result in a net *reduction* in ROG and NOx emissions. Emissions of other criteria pollutants are also expected to be offset by reduced auto emissions. The FSP vehicles will be subject to stringent ARB standards to limit diesel exhaust emissions. The increased travel by FSP vehicles will be extremely minor in comparison to current traffic volumes. Each FSP vehicle is estimated to travel a maximum of 150 miles per day. Assuming up to nine additional vehicles will be needed to implement this TCM, the resulting increased travel will be a maximum of 1,350 miles per day. MTC estimates regional daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in 1998 to be 128,369,000. Even assuming no increase in VMT between 1998 and 2001, the increased VMT resulting from TCM D would represent a 0.001% increase in regional VMT. Based on the air quality benefits of the FSP program, stringent ARB standards for new vehicles, and the insignificant increase in VMT by FSP vehicles, TCM D is not expected to have any adverse impacts with respect to criteria pollutants or diesel exhaust.

4. Biological Resources

Implementation of some of the proposed stationary source control measures may in some cases result in very minor modifications at existing industrial and commercial facilities. No construction outside of existing facilities is expected, so no adverse effects are expected on riparian or other sensitive habitats, federally protected wetlands, wildlife migratory corridors or nursery sites, local biological resource ordinances, or habitat conservation plans.

Implementation of TCM B and TCM C would result in the construction of local bicycle and pedestrian projects such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian plazas and streetscape improvements. The great majority of such projects will occur in already developed areas, but some projects, such as recreational trails, could be located in undeveloped or lightly developed areas. Construction of such projects could potentially impact sensitive habitats, riparian areas or wetlands. As specific projects are proposed for funding, MTC and Caltrans require that project sponsors comply with environmental review processes in CEQA and NEPA. Project sponsors commit to mitigation measures, including measures to protect sensitive habitats and wildlife areas and assure compliance with applicable local

biological resource ordinances and habitat conservation plans, at the time of certification of environmental documentation for specific projects. These commitments obligate project sponsors to implement measures that would minimize or eliminate potential impacts to sensitive habitats and wildlife areas. As noted in the Plan's control measure descriptions, when implementing TCMs B and C MTC will only fund projects that are exempt from CEQA, have no significant adverse environmental impacts or have adequately mitigated any significant adverse environmental impacts.

5. Cultural Resources

Implementation of some of the proposed stationary source control measures may in some cases result in very minor modifications at existing industrial and commercial facilities. No construction outside of existing facilities is expected, so no adverse effects are expected on any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources, or on any human remains.

Implementation of TCM B and TCM C would result in the construction of local bicycle and pedestrian projects such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian plazas and streetscape improvements. The great majority of such projects will occur in already developed areas, but some projects, such as recreational trails, could be located in undeveloped or lightly developed areas. Construction of such projects could potentially impact historical or archaeological resources, including providing the means to preserve and study such resources. As specific projects are proposed for funding, MTC and Caltrans require that project sponsors comply with environmental review processes in CEQA and NEPA. Project sponsors commit to mitigation measures, including measures to protect historical and archaeological resources and human remains, at the time of certification of environmental documentation for specific projects. These commitments obligate project sponsors to implement measures that would minimize or eliminate potential impacts to any cultural resources. As noted in the Plan's control measure descriptions, when implementing TCMs B and C MTC will only fund projects that are exempt from CEQA, have no significant adverse environmental impacts or have adequately mitigated any significant adverse environmental impacts.

6. Geology and Soils

Implementation of some of the proposed stationary source control measures may in some cases result in very minor modifications at existing industrial and commercial facilities. No construction outside of affected facilities is expected. These modifications would be limited and minor and would be subject to applicable local and State building requirements, and thus would not: expose

people or structures to substantial risk from rupture of known earthquake faults, strong seismic shaking, liquefaction or landslide; cause substantial soil erosion; nor be located in soils that are unstable, expansive or incapable of supporting septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems.

Implementation of TCM B and TCM C would result in the construction of local bicycle and pedestrian projects such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian plazas and streetscape improvements. The great majority of such projects will occur in already developed areas, but some projects, such as recreational trails, could be located in undeveloped or lightly developed areas. Construction of such projects could potentially expose users to risk of earthquake, liquefaction or landslide, or be built on soils that are unstable or expansive. As specific projects are proposed for funding, MTC and Caltrans require that project sponsors comply with environmental review processes in CEQA and NEPA. Project sponsors commit to mitigation measures, including local and State building requirements and other measures to protect users from geologic hazards and unstable soils, at the time of certification of environmental documentation for specific projects. These commitments obligate project sponsors to implement measures that would minimize or eliminate potential impacts related to geologic hazards and unstable soils. As noted in the Plan's control measure descriptions, when implementing TCMs B and C MTC will only fund projects that are exempt from CEQA, have no significant adverse environmental impacts or have adequately mitigated any significant adverse environmental impacts.

7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Implementation of control measures SS11, SS13 and SS14 could force manufacturers to reformulate certain coatings and surface preparation and cleanup agents in order to comply with lower VOC limits. In order to meet the lower VOC limits, manufacturers may reformulate applicable coatings, substituting regulated solvents with non-precursor, or "exempt", solvents. Some substitute solvents, such as 1,1,1-trichloroethane, are toxic. This could result in workers or the public being exposed to toxic air contaminants.

As noted above under Air Quality, the BAAQMD's Stratospheric Ozone Policy dictates that District rule development shall assure that rules not promote the use of ozone depleting substances or toxic air contaminants as substitute solvents. As noted in the Plan's control measures descriptions, this policy will apply to rule development activity for SS11, SS13 and SS14. As further noted above under Air Quality, there are other alternatives to the use of exempt solvents that manufacturers may use to achieve lower VOC content in coatings. Given the continued implementation of the BAAQMD's Stratospheric Ozone Policy and the availability of alternatives to exempt solvents, implementation of SS11, SS13 and SS14 is not expected to result in health hazards for workers or the public due to the use of toxic exempt solvents.

Implementation of SS17 will require the use of abatement equipment to control VOC emissions at affected facilities. One potential control technology is carbon adsorption. When the carbon becomes saturated with VOCs it must be “regenerated”, often using steam. Eventually the carbon cannot be regenerated anymore and must be replaced. The spent carbon is considered a hazardous waste and must be disposed of accordingly. There could potentially be an accidental release during storage, handling or transport of spent carbon.

Depressurization of refinery process vessels occurs infrequently, and the amount of spent carbon generated as a result of SS17 will be extremely small. Also, various local, State and federal regulations impose requirements on the storage, handling, transport and disposal of hazardous waste. These regulations include those stated in Section 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations and Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. The extremely small quantities of wastes generated and compliance with applicable regulations will reduce this impact to a level of insignificance.

None of the proposed control measures will create significant public hazards due to potential accidental release of hazardous materials, handle or emit such materials within one-quarter mile of existing schools, involve construction on a hazardous waste site or near an airport, interfere with emergency response plans, or expose people to risks of wildland fires.

8. Hydrology and Water Quality

Implementation of SS11 could result in increased water consumption in the manufacture and clean-up of water-borne coatings if affected coatings were reformulated with water. ARB analyzed this potential impact in the SCM EIR using various conservative assumptions: all coatings affected by the SCM would be reformulated with water rather than other exempt solvents such as acetone; all coatings sold in California were manufactured in California; drought-year water demand projections; no new DWR projects to improve water use efficiency or conservation. ARB concluded that the manufacture and use of reformulated water-borne coatings would create a negligible incremental increase in water demand. Based on this conservative analysis, implementation of SS11 is not expected to have a significant impact on water supplies, including groundwater supplies.

Implementation of SS11 could result in adverse water quality impacts due to an increase in improper disposal of waste generated from affected coatings onto the ground or into storm drains. ARB analyzed this potential impact in the SCM EIR and concluded that the SCM would not result in adverse water quality impacts because: exempt solvents that may be used to reformulate affected coatings are less toxic than currently used solvents; a majority of currently available water-borne coatings contain non-hazardous solvents, and their continued and expanded use should continue in the future; current manufacturing and clean-up

practices are not expected to change as a result of the SCM. Similarly, implementation of SS11 is not expected to cause a violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

Implementation of SS14 would likely lead to increased use of aqueous cleaners, and could impact water quality if cleaning agents became contaminated as they are used and were subsequently disposed of improperly. Some aqueous cleaners are advertised as “sewer safe” because they are non-hazardous and biodegradable, and thus may be disposed of in the sewer system. As the cleaners are used, however, they often become contaminated, and the spent cleaners may contain levels of contamination above allowable wastewater discharge limits.

The South Coast AQMD in 1999 amended their rule for solvent cleaning operations to reduce allowable VOC content (Rule 1171). Using very conservative assumptions, the South Coast AQMD determined that water quality impacts of Rule 1171 would be insignificant. Following adoption of Rule 1171, the Pomona Wastewater Treatment Facility analyzed wastewater streams to evaluate impacts of improper disposal of aqueous solvents and found no significant impacts as a result of Rule 1171.

This issue was also analyzed during rule development for previous amendments to District Regulation 8, Rule 16. As a result, Regulation 8-16 includes provisions that all spent solvents must be disposed of properly (offsite treatment and/or disposal). Rule amendments per SS14 would also include this provision. Many facilities subject to this measure already generate hazardous wastes from other activities, and these wastes must be recycled or disposed of off-site. It is expected that these facilities would include contaminated wastewater in their existing hazardous waste stream.

Based on the lack of a demonstrated adverse impact resulting from South Coast AQMD Rule 1171 and provisions in District rules requiring offsite treatment or disposal of spent solvents, it is expected that implementation of SS14 would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise significantly degrade water quality.

Implementation of SS17 will require the use of abatement equipment to control VOC emissions at affected facilities. One potential control technology is carbon adsorption. When the carbon becomes saturated with VOCs it must be “regenerated”, often using steam. If spent carbon is steam regenerated, this could result in small amounts of wastewater requiring treatment.

Depressurization of refinery process vessels occurs infrequently, and the amount of wastewater requiring treatment would be extremely small. Also, the Regional Water Quality Control Board has established water quality discharge standards

that industrial and commercial facilities must meet. Refineries have in place extensive wastewater collection and treatment systems. The extremely small quantities of wastewater generated and compliance with applicable discharge standards will reduce this impact to a level of insignificance.

Implementation of TCM B and TCM C would result in the construction of local bicycle and pedestrian projects, such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian plazas and streetscape improvements. Some of these projects could cause minor alterations of drainage patterns in the immediate project area or slightly increase runoff water. Any altered drainage patterns or increased runoff would be very minor and would not alter the course of streams or rivers, cause erosion or flooding, or exceed capacities of stormwater drainage systems. As noted in the Plan's control measure descriptions, when implementing TCMs B and C MTC will only fund projects that are exempt from CEQA, have no significant adverse environmental impacts or have adequately mitigated any significant adverse environmental impacts.

None of the proposed control measures would substantially deplete groundwater or substantially interfere with groundwater recharge, place housing or other structures in 100 year flood hazard areas, or expose people or structures to risk of flooding or inundation.

9. Land Use and Planning

Implementation of some of the proposed stationary source control measures may in some cases result in very minor modifications at existing industrial and commercial facilities. No construction outside of affected facilities is expected. These minor modifications would not physically divide an established community, conflict with applicable land use plans, policies and regulations, nor conflict with applicable habitat conservation plans.

Implementation of TCM B and TCM C would result in the construction of local bicycle and pedestrian projects such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian plazas and streetscape improvements. TCM C in particular will provide local agencies with funding to plan and construct pedestrian and community revitalization projects. The great majority of such projects will occur in already developed areas, but some projects, such as recreational trails, could be located in undeveloped or lightly developed areas. Such projects would not physically divide an established community or conflict with applicable land use plans, policies or regulations. In fact, for many such projects, enhancing access and improving connections between land uses is a principal goal. As specific projects are proposed for funding, MTC and Caltrans require that project sponsors comply with environmental review processes in CEQA and NEPA. Project sponsors commit to mitigation measures, including measures to assure that the project complies with applicable land use plans, policies and regulations as well as any applicable habitat conservation plan, at the time of certification of environmental

documentation for specific projects. These commitments obligate project sponsors to implement measures that would minimize or eliminate potential land use conflicts. As noted in the Plan's control measure descriptions, when implementing TCMs B and C MTC will only fund projects that are exempt from CEQA, have no significant adverse environmental impacts or have adequately mitigated any significant adverse environmental impacts.

10. Mineral Resources

Implementation of some of the proposed stationary source control measures may in some cases result in very minor modifications at existing industrial and commercial facilities. Implementation of TCM B and TCM C will result in the construction of local bicycle and pedestrian projects such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian plazas and streetscape improvements. These minor modifications and bike/ped projects would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource nor of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated in a local plan. As noted in the Plan's control measure descriptions, when implementing TCMs B and C MTC will only fund projects that are exempt from CEQA, have no significant adverse environmental impacts or have adequately mitigated any significant adverse environmental impacts.

11. Noise

Implementation of some of the proposed stationary source control measures may in some cases result in very minor modifications at existing industrial and commercial facilities. Any such modifications would be very limited, short-term and located in existing industrial and commercial facilities. Implementation of the proposed stationary source control measures is not expected to expose people to noise levels exceeding local and other applicable standards, cause excessive groundborne vibration, nor create a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels.

Implementation of TCM A would result in new express buses operating in existing freeway corridors. The additional noise from the buses is anticipated to be insignificant given the few buses operating in any corridor relative to overall freeway traffic volumes and noise.

Implementation of TCM B and TCM C would result in construction of local bicycle and pedestrian projects such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian plazas and streetscape improvements. This construction activity could temporarily increase noise levels in surrounding areas. As specific projects are proposed for funding, MTC and Caltrans require that project sponsors comply with environmental review processes in CEQA and NEPA. Project sponsors commit to mitigation measures, including those required by local noise control regulations, at the time of certification of environmental documentation for specific projects. These commitments obligate project sponsors to implement measures that would

minimize or eliminate potential construction-related noise impacts. As noted in the Plan's control measure descriptions, when implementing TCMs B and C MTC will only fund projects that are exempt from CEQA, have no significant adverse environmental impacts or have adequately mitigated any significant adverse environmental impacts.

12. Population and Housing

Implementation of some of the proposed stationary source control measures may in some cases result in very minor modifications at existing industrial and commercial facilities. These modifications would not induce substantial growth nor displace housing or people. Implementation of TCM B and TCM C will result in the construction of local bicycle and pedestrian projects such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian plazas and streetscape improvements. These projects will improve access for pedestrians and bicyclists, but would not induce substantial growth nor displace substantial numbers of housing or people. As noted in the Plan's control measure descriptions, when implementing TCMs B and C MTC will only fund projects that are exempt from CEQA, have no significant adverse environmental impacts or have adequately mitigated any significant adverse environmental impacts.

13. Public Services

Implementation of some of the proposed stationary source control measures may in some cases result in very minor modifications at existing industrial and commercial facilities. Implementation of SS17 will require the use of abatement equipment to control VOC emissions at affected facilities. The most likely control technology involves venting VOCs to a thermal oxidizer, or afterburner. Afterburners involve combustion, and thus there would be a slight increase in the risk of fire at affected facilities. Depressurization of refinery vessels occurs infrequently. The afterburners would be installed at existing petroleum refineries, which have in place extensive emergency response plans, and the very small incremental increase in the risk of fire as a result of SS17 is not expected to significantly increase demand for fire services.

Another possible control technology is carbon adsorption. When the carbon becomes saturated with VOCs it must be "regenerated", often using steam. Eventually the carbon cannot be regenerated anymore and must be replaced. The spent carbon is considered a hazardous waste and must be disposed of accordingly. There could potentially be an accidental release during storage, handling or transport of spent carbon. Depressurization of refinery process vessels occurs infrequently, and the amount of spent carbon generated as a result of SS17 will be extremely small, so it is not expected to significantly increase demand for emergency services. Also, various local, State and federal regulations impose requirements on the storage, handling, transport and disposal of hazardous waste. These regulations include those stated in Section

40 of the Code of Federal Regulations and Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. The extremely small quantities of wastes generated and compliance with applicable regulations will reduce this impact to a level of insignificance.

Implementation of TCM B and TCM C will result in the construction of local bicycle and pedestrian projects such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian plazas and streetscape improvements. In many cases, these projects will improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety, and thus there may be slight decreases in demand for police and emergency services. These minor modifications and bike/ped projects would not require construction of facilities to provide fire protection, nor for police, schools, parks or other public services. As noted in the Plan's control measure descriptions, when implementing TCMs B and C MTC will only fund projects that are exempt from CEQA, have no significant adverse environmental impacts or have adequately mitigated any significant adverse environmental impacts.

14. Recreation

Implementation of some of the proposed stationary source control measures may in some cases result in very minor modifications at existing industrial and commercial facilities. These modifications would have no effect on parks and recreational facilities. Implementation of TCM B and TCM C will result in the construction of local bicycle and pedestrian projects such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian plazas and streetscape improvements. Some of the projects may improve bicycle and pedestrian access to parks and recreational facilities, but would not cause substantial physical deterioration of these facilities or require the construction of new recreational facilities. As noted in the Plan's control measure descriptions, when implementing TCMs B and C MTC will only fund projects that are exempt from CEQA, have no significant adverse environmental impacts or have adequately mitigated any significant adverse environmental impacts.

15. Transportation and Traffic

The purpose of the proposed TCMs is to reduce motor vehicle emissions by either encouraging transit, walking and biking (TCMs A, B, C, E) or reducing incident related congestion (TCM D), which is responsible for about half of all freeway delay. Thus it is expected that implementation of the proposed TCMs will benefit local traffic volumes, congestion, parking and safety.

The slight increase in travel by express buses (TCM A) and freeway service patrol vehicles (TCM D) would be offset by the reduced auto travel and congestion resulting from these measures.

Implementation of TCM B and TCM C would result in construction of local bicycle and pedestrian projects such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian plazas and streetscape improvements. This construction activity in some cases could result in temporary disruptions in traffic patterns in the immediate project area. As specific projects are proposed for funding, MTC and Caltrans require that project sponsors comply with environmental review processes in CEQA and NEPA. Project sponsors commit to mitigation measures, including measures to minimize disruption of local traffic patterns and measures to assure adequate emergency access, at the time of certification of environmental documentation for specific projects. These commitments obligate project sponsors to implement measures that would minimize or eliminate potential construction-related traffic impacts. As noted in the Plan's control measure descriptions, when implementing TCMs B and C MTC will only fund projects that are exempt from CEQA, have no significant adverse environmental impacts or have adequately mitigated any significant adverse environmental impacts.

16. Utilities and Service Systems

Implementation of the proposed control measures is not expected to result in any significant impacts with respect to wastewater treatment requirements, water supply or stormwater facilities. Refer to Section 8, Hydrology and Water Quality, for discussion of these issues. None of the proposed control measures are expected to significantly affect landfill capacity or conflicts with solid waste regulations.

17. Mandatory Findings of Significance

The purpose of the control measures in the 2001 Plan is to improve environmental conditions in the San Francisco Bay Area. While the primary focus is on human health benefits, reduced air pollution in the region will also benefit plant and animal communities. Any construction resulting from implementation of the proposed stationary source control measures would be extremely limited and would consist of very minor modifications at existing industrial and commercial facilities. Construction resulting from implementation of some of the proposed TCMs would consist mainly of local bicycle and pedestrian projects such as bicycle facilities, pedestrian plazas and streetscape improvements. These projects generally will enhance pedestrian and bicyclist safety, improve access and encourage alternative forms of transportation. Any potential adverse secondary impacts associated with these improvements would be mitigated during environmental review that must occur as part of project funding processes through MTC and Caltrans. As noted in the Plan's control measure descriptions, when implementing TCMs B and C MTC will only fund projects that are exempt from CEQA, have no significant adverse environmental impacts or have adequately mitigated any significant adverse environmental impacts. The overall effect of the 2001 Plan will be improved environmental conditions in the region.

Any potential cumulative impacts resulting from implementation of the 2001 Plan, such as diesel exhaust emissions, water impacts associated with use of aqueous solvents, hazards associated with use of substitute solvents or disposal of spent carbon, and traffic impacts related to construction of local bicycle and pedestrian projects will be subject to a variety of local, State and federal regulations and will be extremely small in comparison to existing activity in the region. The environmental impacts of implementation of the proposed control measures are individually insignificant and incrementally insignificant. Therefore, the effects of the proposed 2001 Plan are not “cumulatively considerable” per CEQA Guidelines Section 15065(c).

Implementation of the proposed control measures will have beneficial effects on human beings by reducing air pollution in the region. In addition to contributing to lower ozone levels in the region, some of the proposed control measures will also reduce other air pollutants, including toxic air contaminants, resulting in further benefits to public health.