INITIAL STUDY CEQA APPENDIX G:
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

June 24, 2020

1. **Project title:**
   2020 Plan for Attaining the National Ozone Standards in San Diego County

2. **Lead agency name and address:**
   San Diego County Air Pollution Control District
   10124 Old Grove Road
   San Diego, California 92131

3. **Contact person:**
   Eric Luther
   Air Quality Specialist
   (858) 586-2806
   Eric.luther@sdcounty.ca.gov

4. **Project location**:
   The project is an air quality plan applicable to the jurisdiction of the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (hereafter referred to as the "District"), which covers the entire area within the incorporated and unincorporated portions of San Diego County, the southwestern-most county in the State of California (Figure 1). San Diego County encompasses 4,260 square miles and is bounded on the north by Orange and Riverside Counties, on the east by Imperial County, on the west by the Pacific Ocean, and on the south by the State of Baja California, Mexico.

Figure 1 – San Diego County

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

San Diego County Air Pollution Control District
10124 Old Grove Road
San Diego, CA 92131

6. Description of project:

National and State ambient air quality standards are established for criteria pollutants, which are widespread, common air contaminants known to be harmful to human health and welfare. The criteria pollutants are ozone, inhalable particulate matter, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, lead, and sulfur dioxide. Additional State standards have been established for sulfates and hydrogen sulfide.

The standards are set to protect the elderly, very young, and chronically sensitive portions of the population, and are required to include a reasonable margin of safety to protect against potential hazards which research has not yet identified. In some cases, the State standards provide a wider margin of safety than the national standards. An area that does not meet a particular standard is designated as a nonattainment area for that pollutant and must develop an air quality plan defining the combination of local, State, and federal actions and emission controls necessary for expeditious attainment in the area.

San Diego County is currently designated as a Serious nonattainment area for the 2008 eight-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) (75 ppb), and a Moderate nonattainment area for the 2015 eight-hour ozone NAAQS (70 ppb). The District will be requesting that CARB reclassify San Diego County as a Severe nonattainment area (2008 and 2015 standard) because modeling determined attainment for the Serious/Moderate deadlines not to be feasible. Accordingly, the District must prepare and submit to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), through the California Air Resources Board (CARB), two respective State Implementation Plans (SIPs) identifying control measures and associated emission reductions as necessary to demonstrate attainment of the 75 ppb standard by July 20, 2027 (2026 attainment year), and attainment of the 70 ppb standard by August 3, 2033 (2032 attainment year). This Attainment Plan addresses all requirements for both national ozone standards. Major elements of the proposed Ozone Attainment Plan include:

- Emission Inventory – an updated, comprehensive tabulation of ozone precursor pollutants emitted into the air as a result of various activities, organized by emission source category.
- An Emission Certification Statement which states that the District's existing emission statement reporting rule (Rule 19.3) is sufficient and remains adequate for the purposes of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS for major sources. This Attainment Plan meets the federal requirement by certifying that the existing rule is sufficient for implementation of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS.
- A New Source Review (NSR) program which is required to address emissions from new sources and major modifications to existing sources. The Attainment Plan meets this requirement through the District's existing NSR-series rules, which were updated in April 2016 and June 2019. The 2019 rule revision incorporated applicability thresholds (25 tons of per year) and offset ratios (1.3-to-1) up to an Extreme nonattainment area classification if necessary. As such, upon reclassification to a Severe nonattainment area, the region will satisfy NSR requirements in the Clean Air Act (CAA).
- A summary of Emission Control Measures identifying a comprehensive set of stationary and mobile source control measures necessary to achieve attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable. A summary of the measures is not required by the CAA but is necessary to understand the region's comprehensive strategy for attainment. The air quality plan includes six proposed amendments to existing control measures (69.2.1 – Small Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators, 69.4.1– Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, 69.3/69.3.1 – Stationary Gas Turbine Engines, 67.0.1 - Architectural Coatings, 61.2 - Transfer of Organic Compounds into Mobile Transport Tanks and

67.6.1 - Cold Solvent Cleaning and Stripping Operations) and two new proposed control measures (69.2.2 – Medium Boilers, Process Heaters and Steam Generators, and Control of Emissions from Major Source Landfill Flares).

- A Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) Demonstration to determine whether the control measures relied on in this Attainment Plan meet RACT requirements for the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS. RACT is federally defined as the lowest emission limitation that a particular source is capable of meeting by the application of control technology that is reasonably available considering technological and economic feasibility. Ozone nonattainment areas classified as Moderate or above must reevaluate and assure RACT requirements are met for each applicable category of VOC and NOx stationary sources.
- On-road Emission Budgets for federal regulatory programs, known as Transportation Conformity, to ensure the conformity of transportation plans and programs with the SIP. Transportation plans, programs, and projects receiving federal funding or approval must be fully consistent with the region's applicable SIP before being approved by the region's Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) (i.e. SANDAG). This Attainment Plan reinforces the existing approved on-road motor vehicle budgets for VOC and NOx, as well as establishes new budgets for future Reasonable Further Progress (RFP) milestone and attainment years associated with the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS.
- A Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) Growth Offset demonstration, validating the region has adopted sufficient transportation measures to offset any growth in vehicle emissions in the Attainment Plan period. The VMT Offset demonstration confirms the identified transportation control strategies and transportation control measures in place in San Diego County are sufficient to demonstrate the full motor vehicle control program emissions in future attainment years are lower than the emissions from the motor vehicle control program frozen at 2017 levels.
- An analysis of Reasonably Available Control Measures (RACM) to verify that all RACM (including stationary, transportation-related, and mobile) are being implemented as expeditiously as practicable. This Attainment Plan's RACM analysis demonstrates there are no additional economically and technologically feasible control measures (alone or in conjunction with others) that could advance the attainment year for the 2008 or 2015 ozone NAAQS.
- A demonstration of RFP which is required pursuant to the EPA's implementation rule for areas classified as Moderate or above to demonstrate continual progress. The region must achieve annual reductions in emissions as necessary to attain the applicable standard. This requirement ensures that nonattainment areas will not delay implementation of emission control programs until immediately prior to the attainment deadline.
- An Attainment Demonstration developed pursuant to federal requirements, which is comprised of photochemical air quality simulation modeling and other approved analytical techniques (collectively called the "Weight of Evidence"). Together, these analyses demonstrate the ability of the Emission Control Measures to provide for attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable.
- Contingency Measures which must be implemented in the event of EPA making a finding that a regulatory requirement has not been met, such as failure to attain the NAAQS by the attainment deadline. The Contingency Measures requirement is intended to ensure emission reduction progress continues while the failure is being corrected. Contingency measures in San Diego County have historically relied solely upon several mobile source control programs at the state level, which will be implemented regardless of contingency measure requirements and result in an on- going emissions reduction trend. However, the District has included an additional contingency measure in this Attainment Plan that will be enacted upon the EPA making a formal finding that San Diego County failed to

satisfy a regulatory requirement necessitating implementation of the contingency measure.

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

Topography - San Diego County is divided by the Laguna Mountain Range, which runs approximately parallel to the coast about 45 miles inland and separates the coastal area from the desert portion of the County. The Laguna Mountains reach peaks of over 6,000 feet with Hot Springs Mountain peak rising to 6,533 feet, the highest point in the County. The coastal region is made up of coastal terraces that rise from the ocean into wide mesas which then, moving farther east, transition into the Laguna Foothills.

Farther east, the topography gradually rises to the rugged mountains. On the east side, the mountains drop off rapidly to the Anza-Borrego Desert, which is characterized by several broken mountain ranges with desert valleys in between. To the north of the County are the Santa Ana Mountains which run along the coast of Orange County, turning east to join with the Laguna Mountains near the San Diego-Orange County border.

Climatology - The climate of San Diego County, as with all of Southern California, is largely dominated by the strength and position of the semi-permanent, high-pressure system over the Pacific Ocean (known as the Pacific High). This high- pressure ridge over the West Coast often creates a pattern of late-night and early- morning low clouds, hazy afternoon sunshine, daytime onshore breezes, and little temperature variation year-round. The climatic classification for San Diego is a Mediterranean climate, with warm, dry summers and mild, wet winters. Average annual precipitation ranges from approximately 10 inches on the coast to over 30 inches in the mountains to the east (the desert regions of San Diego County generally receive between 4 and 6 inches per year).

The favorable climate of San Diego works to create air pollution problems. Sinking or subsiding air from the Pacific High creates a temperature inversion (known as a subsidence inversion), which acts as a lid to vertical dispersion of pollutants. Weak summertime pressure gradients further limit horizontal dispersion of pollutants in the mixed layer below the subsidence inversion. Poorly dispersed anthropogenic (man- made) emissions, combined with strong sunshine, lead to photochemical reactions, creating ozone in this surface layer.

Daytime onshore flow (i.e., sea breeze) and nighttime offshore flow (i.e., land breeze) are quite common in Southern California. The sea breeze helps to moderate daytime temperatures in the western portion of San Diego County, which greatly adds to the climatic draw of the region. This also leads to emissions being blown out to sea at night and returning to land the following day. Under certain conditions, this atmospheric oscillation results in the offshore transport of air from the Los Angeles region to San Diego County, which often results in high ozone concentrations being measured at San Diego County air pollution monitoring stations. Transport of air pollutants from Los Angeles to San Diego has also been shown to occur aloft within the stable layer of the elevated subsidence inversion. In this layer, removed from fresh emissions of oxides of nitrogen, which would scavenge and reduce ozone concentrations, high levels of ozone are transported into San Diego County.

8. **Other public agencies whose approval is required:**

CARB- Concurrence with the Ozone Attainment Plan and submittal to EPA for inclusion in the applicable State Implementation Plan.
EPA - Approval of the Ozone Attainment Plan for inclusion in the applicable State Implementation Plan.

9. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

No, Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area have not yet requested consultation about the 2020 Plan for Attaining the National Ozone Standards in San Diego County. Local Native American tribes have been given notice of public workshops and online access to the documents and can provide comments if they choose. Specifically, outreach and consultation occurred with San Diego County tribes in Spring 2020.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency) On the

basis of this initial evaluation:

☒ 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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED 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 "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

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

_____ _____

Signature Date

_____ _____

Signature Date

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

Discussion:

(a) through (d): The proposed 2020 Plan provides for attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable, pursuant to federal requirements. It reflects comprehensive, currently adopted control requirements implemented to reduce pollution from mobile and stationary emission sources, and includes six proposed amendments to existing control measures (69.2.1 – Small Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators, 69.4.1– Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, 69.3/69.3.1 – Stationary Gas Turbine Engines, 67.0.1 - Architectural Coatings, 61.2 - Transfer of Organic Compounds into Mobile Transport Tanks and 67.6.1 - Cold Solvent Cleaning and Stripping Operations) and two new proposed control measures (69.2.2 – Medium Boilers, Process Heaters and Steam Generators, and Control of Emissions from Major Source Landfill Flares). These measures will be analyzed individually for environmental impacts if and when they are proposed for adoption. Project implementation would not require the construction of any building, structure, or other visual obstruction; would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; would not substantially damage scenic resources; would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the surroundings; and would not create a new source of light or glare adversely affecting day or nighttime views.

Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on aesthetics.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping 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) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

(a) through (e): The proposed 2020 Plan provides for attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable, pursuant to federal requirements. It reflects comprehensive, currently adopted control requirements implemented to reduce pollution from mobile and stationary emission sources, and includes six proposed amendments to existing control measures (69.2.1 – Small Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators, 69.4.1– Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, 69.3/69.3.1 – Stationary Gas Turbine Engines, 67.0.1 - Architectural Coatings, 61.2 - Transfer of Organic Compounds into Mobile Transport Tanks and 67.6.1 - Cold Solvent Cleaning and Stripping Operations) and two new proposed control measures (69.2.2 – Medium Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators and Control of Emissions from Major Source Landfill Flares). These measures will be analyzed individually for environmental impacts if and when they are proposed for adoption. Project implementation would not require the taking of any land for construction of any building or structure; would not convert prime or unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance to non-agricultural use; would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson contract; and would not involve other changes that might ultimately result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on agricultural resources.

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:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

(a) – (e) The proposed 2020 Plan provides for attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable, pursuant to federal requirements. It reflects comprehensive, currently adopted control requirements implemented to reduce pollution from mobile and stationary emission sources, and includes six proposed amendments to existing control measures (69.2.1 – Small Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators, 69.4.1– Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, 69.3/69.3.1 – Stationary Gas Turbine Engines, 67.0.1 - Architectural Coatings, 61.2 - Transfer of Organic Compounds into Mobile Transport Tanks and 67.6.1 - Cold Solvent Cleaning and Stripping Operations) and two new proposed control measures (69.2.2 – Medium Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators and Control of Emissions from Major Source Landfill Flares). These measures will be analyzed individually for environmental impacts if and when they are proposed for adoption. The proposed Attainment Plan will be submitted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for inclusion in the applicable State Implementation Plan (SIP), following adoption by the District Board and concurrence by the California Air Resources Board. For these reasons, and based on analyses presented in the proposed Attainment Plan, project implementation would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the air quality plan; would not violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation; would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which San Diego County is non-attainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors); would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; and would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.
Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on air quality.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

(a) – (f) The proposed 2020 Plan provides for attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable, pursuant to federal requirements. It reflects comprehensive, currently adopted control requirements implemented to reduce pollution from mobile and stationary emission sources, and includes six proposed amendments to existing control measures (69.2.1 – Small Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators, 69.4.1 – Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, 69.3/69.3.1 – Stationary Gas Turbine Engines, 67.0.1 - Architectural Coatings, 61.2 - Transfer of Organic Compounds into Mobile Transport Tanks and 67.6.1 - Cold Solvent Cleaning and Stripping Operations) and two new proposed control measures (69.2.2 – Medium Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators and Control of Emissions from Major Source Landfill Flares). These measures will be analyzed individually for environmental impacts if and when they are proposed for adoption. Project implementation would have no effect 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; would have no effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; would have no effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by §404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; would not interfere 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; would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; and would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.

Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on biological resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

(a)– (d) The proposed 2020 Plan provides for attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable, pursuant to federal requirements. It reflects comprehensive, currently adopted control requirements implemented to reduce pollution from mobile and stationary emission sources, and includes six proposed amendments to existing control measures (69.2.1 – Small Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators, 69.4.1 – Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, 69.3/69.3.1 – Stationary Gas Turbine Engines, 67.0.1 - Architectural Coatings, 61.2 - Transfer of Organic Compounds into Mobile Transport Tanks and 67.6.1 - Cold Solvent Cleaning and Stripping Operations) and two new proposed control measures (69.2.2 – Medium Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators and Control of Emissions from Major Source Landfill Flares). These measures will be analyzed individually for environmental impacts if and when they are proposed for adoption. Project implementation would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource; would not destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; and would not disturb any human remains.

Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on cultural resources.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	☐	☐	☐	☒
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.	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☒

(a) – (e) The proposed 2020 Plan provides for attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable, pursuant to federal requirements. It reflects comprehensive, currently adopted control requirements implemented to reduce pollution from mobile and stationary emission sources, and includes six proposed amendments to existing control measures (69.2.1 – Small Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators, 69.4.1 – Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, 69.3/69.3.1 – Stationary Gas Turbine Engines, 67.0.1 - Architectural Coatings, 61.2 - Transfer of Organic Compounds into Mobile Transport Tanks and 67.6.1 - Cold Solvent Cleaning and Stripping Operations) and two new proposed control measures (69.2.2 –Medium Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators and Control of Emissions from Major Source Landfill Flares). These measures will be analyzed individually for environmental impacts if and when they are proposed for adoption. Project implementation would not expose people to the risk of loss, injury, or death associated with earthquakes, seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction or landslides. It would not result in soil erosion, loss of topsoil, be located on soil that is unstable, or located on expansive soil. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on geology/soils.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

(a) – (b) The proposed 2020 Plan provides for attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable, pursuant to federal requirements. It reflects comprehensive, currently adopted control requirements implemented to reduce pollution from mobile and stationary emission sources, and includes six proposed amendments to existing control measures (69.2.1 – Small Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators, 69.4.1 – Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, 69.3/69.3.1 – Stationary Gas Turbine Engines, 67.0.1 - Architectural Coatings, 61.2 - Transfer of Organic Compounds into Mobile Transport Tanks and 67.6.1 - Cold Solvent Cleaning and Stripping Operations) and two new proposed control measures (69.2.2 – Medium Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators and Control of Emissions from Major Source Landfill Flares). These measures will be analyzed individually for environmental impacts if and when they are proposed for adoption. Project implementation would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The plan is likely to reduce GHG emissions and will not locally contribute to climate change. Since the plan incorporates rules that will minimize emissions from combustion sources (boilers, engines and landfill flares) and incorporates the regional transportation plan that minimizes vehicle miles traveled from mobile sources of combustion (cars, trucks) the plan will have the co-benefit of reducing GHG emissions.

Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on greenhouse gases.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☐	☒

(a) – (h) The proposed 2020 Plan provides for attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable, pursuant to federal requirements. It reflects comprehensive, currently adopted control requirements implemented to reduce pollution from mobile and stationary emission sources, and includes six proposed amendments to existing control measures (69.2.1 – Small Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators, 69.4.1 – Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, 69.3/69.3.1- Stationary Gas Turbine Engines, 67.0.1 - Architectural Coatings, 61.2 - Transfer of Organic Compounds into Mobile Transport Tanks and 67.6.1 - Cold Solvent Cleaning and Stripping Operations) and two new proposed control measures (69.2.2 – Medium Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators and Control of Emissions from Major Source Landfill Flares). These measures will be analyzed individually for environmental impacts if and when they are proposed for adoption. Project implementation would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials; would not 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; and would not emit hazardous emissions, or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; would not require the construction of any building, structure or facility which could potentially be located on or a site pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; would not require the construction of any building, structure or facility which could potentially be located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip that would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan; and would not expose people or structures to wildland fires.

Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on hazards/hazardous materials.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

(a) - (j) The proposed 2020 Plan provides for attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable, pursuant to federal requirements. It reflects comprehensive, currently adopted control requirements implemented to reduce pollution from mobile and stationary emission sources, and includes six proposed amendments to existing control measures (69.2.1 – Small Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators, 69.4.1 – Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, 69.3/69.3.1 – Stationary Gas Turbine Engines, 67.0.1 - Architectural Coatings, 61.2 - Transfer of Organic Compounds into Mobile Transport Tanks and 67.6.1 - Cold Solvent Cleaning and Stripping Operations) and two new proposed control measures (69.2.2 –Medium Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators and Control of Emissions from Major Source Landfill Flares). These measures will be analyzed individually for environmental impacts if and when they are proposed for adoption. Project implementation would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge; would not require construction or other activities which would substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of a site or area in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; would not require construction or other activities which would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff water in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; would not place structures which would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area; and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, death, inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on hydrology/water quality.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

(a) – (c): The proposed 2020 Plan provides for attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable, pursuant to federal requirements. It reflects comprehensive, currently adopted control requirements implemented to reduce pollution from mobile and stationary emission sources, and includes six proposed amendments to existing control measures (69.2.1 – Small Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators, 69.4.1 – Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, 69.3/69.3.1 – Stationary Gas Turbine Engines, 67.0.1 - Architectural Coatings, 61.2 - Transfer of Organic Compounds into Mobile Transport Tanks and 67.6.1 - Cold Solvent Cleaning and Stripping Operations) and two new proposed control measures (69.2.2 – Medium Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators and Control of Emissions from Major Source Landfill Flares). These measures will be analyzed individually for environmental impacts if and when they are proposed for adoption. Project implementation would not physically divide an established community; would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; and would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation or natural community conservation plan.

Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on land use/planning.

XI. **Mineral Resources**. Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

(a) – (b) The proposed 2020 Plan provides for attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable, pursuant to federal requirements. It reflects comprehensive, currently adopted control requirements implemented to reduce pollution from mobile and stationary emission sources, and includes six proposed amendments to existing control measures (69.2.1 – Small Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators, 69.4.1 – Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines,69.3/69.3.1– Stationary Gas Turbine Engines, 67.0.1 - Architectural Coatings, 61.2 - Transfer of Organic Compounds into Mobile Transport Tanks and 67.6.1 - Cold Solvent Cleaning and Stripping Operations) and two new proposed control measures (69.2.2 – Medium Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators and Control of Emissions from Major Source Landfill Flares). These measures will be analyzed individually for environmental impacts if and when they are proposed for adoption. Project implementation would not 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; and would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site.

. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on mineral resources.

XII. NOISE -- Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

(a) – (f) The proposed 2020 Plan provides for attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable, pursuant to federal requirements. It reflects comprehensive, currently adopted control requirements implemented to reduce pollution from mobile and stationary emission sources, and includes six proposed amendments to existing control measures (69.2.1 – Small Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators, 69.4.1 – Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, 69.3/69.3.1 – Stationary Gas Turbine Engines, 67.0.1 - Architectural Coatings, 61.2 - Transfer of Organic Compounds into Mobile Transport Tanks and 67.6.1 - Cold Solvent Cleaning and Stripping Operations) and two new proposed control measures (69.2.2 – Medium Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators and Control of Emissions from Major Source Landfill Flares). These measures will be analyzed individually for environmental impacts if and when they are proposed for adoption. Project implementation would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of applicable standards; would not expose people to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or noise; and would not affect any airport land use plan or private air strip. Temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels are less than significant because emission control equipment may create temporary sounds that would not be substantial or permanent.

Based on this discussion it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on noise.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

(a) – (c) The proposed 2020 Plan provides for attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable, pursuant to federal requirements. It reflects comprehensive, currently adopted control requirements implemented to reduce pollution from mobile and stationary emission sources, and includes six proposed amendments to existing control measures (69.2.1 – Small Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators, 69.4.1 – Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, 69.3/69.3.1 – Stationary Gas Turbine Engines, 67.0.1 - Architectural Coatings, 61.2 - Transfer of Organic Compounds into Mobile Transport Tanks and 67.6.1 - Cold Solvent Cleaning and Stripping Operations) and two new proposed control measures (69.2.2 – Medium Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators and Control of Emissions from Major Source Landfill Flares). These measures will be analyzed individually for environmental impacts if and when they are proposed for adoption.
Project implementation would not induce substantial growth and would not displace substantial numbers of housing or people, requiring the construction of replacement housing.
Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on population/housing.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

(a) The proposed 2020 Plan provides for attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable, pursuant to federal requirements. It reflects comprehensive, currently adopted control requirements implemented to reduce pollution from mobile and stationary emission sources, and includes six proposed amendments to existing control measures (69.2.1 – Small Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators, 69.4.1 – Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, 69.3/69.3.1 – Stationary Gas Turbine Engines, 67.0.1 - Architectural Coatings, 61.2 - Transfer of Organic Compounds into Mobile Transport Tanks and 67.6.1 - Cold Solvent Cleaning and Stripping Operations) and two new proposed control measures (69.2.2 –Medium Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators and Control of Emissions from Major Source Landfill Flares). These measures will be analyzed individually for environmental impacts if and when they are proposed for adoption. There will be no physical impacts to governmental facilities, and no new or altered governmental facilities would be required to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for public services.

Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on public services.

XV. RECREATION.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

(b) – (b) The proposed 2020 Plan provides for attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable, pursuant to federal requirements. It reflects comprehensive, currently adopted control requirements implemented to reduce pollution from mobile and stationary emission sources, and includes six proposed amendments to existing control measures (69.2.1 – Small Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators, 69.4.1 – Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, 69.3/69.3.1 – Stationary Gas Turbine Engines, 67.0.1 - Architectural Coatings, 61.2 - Transfer of Organic Compounds into Mobile Transport Tanks and 67.6.1 - Cold Solvent Cleaning and Stripping Operations) and two new proposed control measures (69.2.2 – Medium Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators and Control of Emissions from Major Source Landfill Flares). These measures will be analyzed individually for environmental impacts if and when they are proposed for adoption. Project implementation would not result in increased use of any existing neighborhood park, regional park or recreation facility. The project does not include recreational facilities, nor does it require construction or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, it is expected that the project would have no adverse impact on recreational facilities.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Result in a change in any 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) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

(a) - (f) The proposed 2020 Plan provides for attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable, pursuant to federal requirements. It reflects comprehensive, currently adopted control requirements implemented to reduce pollution from mobile and stationary emission sources, and includes six proposed amendments to existing control measures (69.2.1 – Small Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators, 69.4.1 – Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, 69.3/69.3.1 – Stationary Gas Turbine Engines, 67.0.1 - Architectural Coatings, 61.2 - Transfer of Organic Compounds into Mobile Transport Tanks and 67.6.1 - Cold Solvent Cleaning and Stripping Operations) and two new proposed control measures (69.2.2 –Medium Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators and Control of Emissions from Major Source Landfill Flares). These measures will be analyzed individually for environmental impacts if and when they are proposed for adoption. Project implementation would not cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system; would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of standard established by the regional congestion management agency for any road or highway; would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses; would not result in inadequate emergency access or parking capacity; and would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The proposed 2020 plan incorporates San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, which is designed to minimize car travel and promote mass transit, biking and walking. The Regional Plan may increase traffic in certain areas but is intended to decrease overall traffic levels, and would have a less than significant impact on traffic patterns and safety risks. Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on transportation/traffic.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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? Less than significant?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

(a) – (g) The proposed 2020 Plan provides for attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable, pursuant to federal requirements. It reflects comprehensive, currently adopted control requirements implemented to reduce pollution from mobile and stationary emission sources, and includes six proposed amendments to existing control measures (69.2.1 – Small Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators, 69.4.1 – Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, 69.3/69.3.1 – Stationary Gas Turbine Engines, 67.0.1 - Architectural Coatings, 61.2 - Transfer of Organic Compounds into Mobile Transport Tanks and 67.6.1 - Cold Solvent Cleaning and Stripping Operations) and two new proposed control measures (69.2.2 – Medium Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators and Control of Emissions from Major Source Landfill Flares). These measures will be analyzed individually for environmental impacts if and when they are proposed for adoption. Project implementation would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the regional water quality control board; would not require or result in the construction of new water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage facilities, or the expansion of existing facilities; would not require water supplies in excess of existing entitlements and resources or require new or expanded entitlements; would not require additional wastewater treatment capacity or landfill capacity; and would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on utilities/service systems.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii)A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☐	☐	☒

(a) The proposed 2020 Plan provides for attainment of the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously aspracticable, pursuant to federal requirements. It reflects comprehensive, currently adopted control requirements implemented to reduce pollution from mobile and stationary emission sources, and includes six proposed amendments to existing control measures (69.2.1 – Small Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators, 69.4.1 – Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, 69.3/69.3.1 – Stationary Gas Turbine Engines, 67.0.1 - Architectural Coatings, 61.2 - Transfer of Organic Compounds into Mobile Transport Tanks and 67.6.1 - Cold Solvent Cleaning and Stripping Operations) and two new proposed control measures (69.2.2 – Medium Boilers, Process Heaters, and Steam Generators and Control of Emissions from Major Source Landfill Flares). These measures will be analyzed individually for environmental impacts if and when they are proposed for adoption. No substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or a resource with significance to a California Native American tribe will be affected.

Based on the above discussion, it is expected that project implementation would have no adverse impact on tribal cultural resources.

XVIV. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Based on the analysis in this document, the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District finds that 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. The project does not have cumulatively considerable impacts, nor does it have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.